





NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE




TRENT UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY











Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation



# The Canadian Historical Association

---

Report of the Annual Meeting  
Held at Toronto,  
May 25-6, 1942

With Historical Papers

Edited by R. G. RIDDELL and R. M. SAUNDERS

---

TORONTO  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS  
1942

THE  
CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1941-1942

*Past President*

Gustave Lanctot

*President*

FRED LANDON

*Vice-President*

A. R. M. LOWER

*English Secretary and Treasurer*

NORMAN FEE, Ottawa

*French Secretary*

SÉRAPHIN MARION, Ottawa

---

*Council*

E. R. ADAIR, Montreal  
A. G. BAILEY, Fredericton  
J. B. BREBNER, New York  
B. BROUILLETTE, Montreal  
GEORGE W. BROWN, Toronto  
A. L. BURT, Minneapolis  
D. G. CREIGHTON, Toronto  
R. FLENLEY, Toronto

WATSON KIRKCONNELL, Hamilton  
W. KAYE LAMB, Vancouver  
R. S. LONGLEY, Wolfville  
GUSTAVE LANCTOT, Ottawa  
ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX, Quebec  
A. S. MORTON, Saskatoon  
F. H. UNDERHILL, Toronto



## CONTENTS\*

	<i>Page</i>
The Canadian Scene, 1880-1890 (The Presidential Address), by FRED LONDON .....	5
M. de la Dauversière, L'Homme qui fonda Montréal (résumé de la communication présentée par M. JEAN BRUCHESI) .....	19
The Evolution of Montreal under the French Régime, by E. R. ADAIR .....	20
L'Atterrissage de Jacques Cartier dans l'île de Montréal (résumé de la communication présentée par M. GUSTAVE LANCTOT) .....	42
Economic Nationalism and Confederation, by D. G. CREIGHTON .....	44
The Failure of the Historians, by H. N. FIELDHOUSE .....	52
The Fur-Seal Fisheries and the Doctrine of the Freedom of the Seas, by CHARLES C. TANSILL .....	71
American Concern over Canadian Railway Competition in the North-West, 1885-1890, by ROSEMARY LORNA SAVAGE .....	82
Canadian Political Ideas in the Sixties and Seventies: Egerton Ryerson, by C. B. SISSONS .....	94
Political Ideas of the Upper Canada Reformers, 1867-78, by FRANK H. UNDERHILL .....	104
National Historic Parks and Sites, by the National Parks Bureau, Lands, Parks, and Forests Branch, Department of Mines and Resources .....	116
Report of the Secretary, by NORMAN FEE .....	121
Report of the Treasurer, by NORMAN FEE .....	123
List of Members and Affiliated Associations .....	124

---

\*Two papers delivered at the meeting will be published elsewhere than in this *Report*. That by Mr. J. I. Cooper of McGill University, "The Political Ideas of George Etienne Cartier," is to be published in the September issue of the *Canadian Historical Review*. The paper delivered by Mr. F. R. Scott at the joint session of the Canadian Historical Association and the Canadian Political Science Association, entitled "Political Nationalism and Confederation," appeared in the August issue of the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*.





## THE CANADIAN SCENE, 1880-1890

Presidential Address by FRED LANDON  
*The University of Western Ontario*

THE general pattern of Canadian affairs during the 1880's is familiar to every student of Canadian history. At the opening of the decade there were visible signs of recovery from the depression which had come down upon the continent during the seventies. The return of the Liberal-Conservative party to power in 1878 had assured the completion of the transcontinental railroad promised to British Columbia and had made equally certain the adoption of a changed national trade policy. The new trade policy was in force by 1879 and in September, 1880, a contract was signed with private capitalists to complete the railroad project. These two developments provided the major federal issues of the early 1880's and for a brief period brought some measure of prosperity. In 1885 came the uprising in the West under Louis Riel. His trial and subsequent execution unloosed a train of racial and creed disputes that plagued the country for a decade and diverted energies sadly needed for other activities. Contemporary with these later events a new trade issue arose which was still a matter of controversy when the period closed with business depression, a lag in population growth and annexationist sentiment in the air. To many Canadians in 1890 the high promise of Confederation must have seemed to be but a mirage.

This pattern, however, like many other accepted patterns in history is incomplete. It is that which chiefly impressed those who were contemporary with the events, and it is the picture which has been brought to us in the more familiar memoirs of the times. Unfortunately these memoirs are chiefly political in character and show little interest in other phases of the national life. The period was one of great controversy and the controversy overshadowed and still overshadows much that was an essential part of Canadian life. It is in part the purpose of this paper to fix attention upon some other of the activities and interests of the Canadian people during the decade and to suggest that such activities and interests merit more attention than they have hitherto received. At the outset, however, some notice may properly be taken of the political figures who in the ten years after 1880 were most in the public eye. As a group they still challenge our attention. Moreover, in the eighties, and even beyond that period, it was the political figures to whom attention was chiefly directed. The decade produced a remarkable group of railroad builders but it was at a later date rather than in the period of their constructive activity that their achievements received adequate recognition. Industrial development had not yet proceeded sufficiently far to bring the business man as such into first-rate prominence, nor had public attention yet been turned to mining magnates, promoters of power development, owners of metropolitan newspapers, or university professors. Canadians as individuals still loved and hated, with about equal measure of intensity, the leaders of their own and the opposite party.

At the head of the federal government during the whole decade was Sir John Macdonald, now grown old and tired but with a hold on his party which was unshaken. Shrewd in judgment and magnetic in personality, he had become a sort of national institution, so much so that

his political opponents came to despair of success until he should pass off the scene. In November, 1884, Macdonald celebrated the fortieth anniversary of his entry into public life, the occasion being marked by a great banquet at Toronto. Two months later, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, Montreal rivalled Toronto in the tribute paid by the party stalwarts to their leader. "There has never been anything of the kind approaching it in magnificence or significance," Macdonald wrote to Tupper after the Toronto dinner, while of the Montreal demonstration he remarked: "Of a different character but equally satisfactory. French and English vied with each other. Two miles of torches on a dark soft night, with the air filled with fireworks wherever we went. The whole people of the city in the streets. . . . The banquet a marvel of skill and decoration."<sup>1</sup>

But the editor of the *Week*, at Toronto, was inclined to be cynical over the carefully arranged fireworks, both chemical and oratorical.

Not even the speakers themselves [he wrote] can imagine that their hyperbolic tirades have any relation to the facts, or that their presentation of political history will ever be deemed worthy of notice by the historian. As to answering the statements or the arguments, a man of sense would as soon think of answering a bagpipe. Yet all is not laughable in these orgies of partisanship. The banquetters go away drunk with a wine even more deadly than the sherry. They are more than ever inflamed with party passion. They have learned more than ever to put party above their country, to regard half their fellow-citizens as their enemies, and to believe that everything is moral in politics which can put power and patronage into the hands of the Conquering Hero or the Beloved Chief.<sup>2</sup>

Looking back at the period under consideration we can see that there was some similarity between the Liberal-Conservative party in the later 1880's and the old Whig party of the forties in the United States. For years the Whig cause consisted in the adulation of its leaders, Clay and Webster, rather than in support of well-established political principles. Thus when Clay and Webster passed off the scene in 1852 the party rapidly disintegrated. Liberal-Conservatism had not reached that point in 1885 but dependence was being placed more and more in the name and fame of Macdonald so that after his death in 1891 it was but a matter of time until the party would go down to defeat. "The idolatry of the heathen is not greater than the idolatry of party politics today," Principal Grant, of Queen's, declared in 1884. It was an unhealthy spirit which extended even to ordinary social intercourse. In contrast to the freer atmosphere of Mackenzie's day, Lady Macdonald in her social entertainment drew the political line as sharply as the colour line in the Southern States. No Liberal or any member of his family was ever invited to Earnscliffe. Nor was this unwholesome political ex-

<sup>1</sup>Sir Joseph Pope (ed.), *Correspondence of Sir John Macdonald* (Toronto, n.d.), 328, 331-2.

<sup>2</sup>The *Week*, Jan. 22, 1885, 114.



clusiveness confined to Lady Macdonald. It had become the rule rather than the exception.<sup>3</sup>

Opposing Macdonald from 1880 until after the election of 1887 was Edward Blake, great in intellect and powerful in debate but lacking that something which wins elections. He has been compared with Lord Rosebery both in the matter of his political qualities and in his political fortunes. Had he faced any other opponent than Macdonald he would probably have been victorious. That veteran Canadian parliamentarian, R. S. White, has said of the series of speeches which Blake delivered in the election of 1882 that the reading of them "makes one marvel that he did not sweep the country, so logical and convincing and destructive of the policy of his political opponents were they."<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, such qualities in political debate do not necessarily win elections whether the year be 1882 or 1942. But if Blake failed to attain office himself, he at least nominated successors in both the provincial and federal fields whose tenure was not easily shaken. When he retired after the defeat of 1887 his mantle fell upon his young French-Canadian lieutenant from Quebec, Wilfrid Laurier. Laurier's commission came from party leaders who were none too sure of the wisdom of their choice, while he himself was equally hesitant about accepting the responsibility. He formally accepted the leadership on June 23, 1887, and it was on June 23, 1896, nine years later to a day, that the Liberal party came to power.

One who looked down from the gallery of the House of Commons in 1880 upon the floor beneath would have found a remarkable number of men whose names are still remembered. On the ministerial side were Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Leonard Tilley, Hector Langevin, John Henry Pope, and Mackenzie Bowell. Both Tupper and Bowell were to be successors of Macdonald in the office of Prime Minister. Seated behind and about Macdonald were J. J. C. Abbott, another future Prime Minister, and A. P. Caron, John Haggart, Thomas White, John Costigan, and John Carling, all future members of the Cabinet. D'Alton McCarthy was there, chief lieutenant of the Ontario Conservative group but destined to break with his party and leader before the decade was out. There too was Donald Smith, who seven years before had helped to send Macdonald into opposition but was now again reconciled with leader and party.

Blake's followers in 1880 numbered only half that of the government side of the house but the group did not lack distinction. Richard Cartwright, William McDougall, John Charlton, Malcolm Cameron, and David Mills were men who would not be overlooked in any Canadian Parliament. Alexander Mackenzie was there too, Prime Minister from 1873 to 1878, but his voice was now stilled and his active career at an end. A visitor might have noticed Frederick Borden who in later years would be a Minister of Militia, and if he did not see he would probably hear William Paterson, of stentorian voice, a later Minister of Customs

<sup>3</sup>"Ottawa is not as gay as it was in Mr. Mackenzie's time and the earlier days of the present government. . . . In the days of Reform rule the wife of the Prime Minister entertained the Tories as well as Grits, and other ladies followed her example. There are a few houses in which members of the opposing factions still meet under the same roof, and at the dinners at Rideau Hall, and at those given by the Speaker of each branch of the Legislature the wolf lies down with the lamb. But, as a rule, the cleavage of politics regulates the social cleavage" (*The Week*, April 10, 1884).

<sup>4</sup>*Dalhousie Review*, XVI, 1936-7, 9.

under Laurier. But the man who was to be most conspicuous of all in the days ahead was as yet not so recognized. Laurier, quiet and studious, of somewhat indifferent health and seldom heard in the House, had not yet revealed the abilities that would make him leader of his party. It remained for the tragic events of 1885 to show forth his powers.

These then were the men most prominent at Ottawa in 1880. But in the provincial fields were others whose influence upon Canadian affairs was to be large. Oliver Mowat remained Premier of the Province of Ontario during the whole of the 1880's. Chapleau, Premier of Quebec in 1880, soon left that field for Ottawa. In Nova Scotia in 1880 John S. D. Thompson was Attorney-General. He was to come to Ottawa in 1885 as Minister of Justice and to become Prime Minister of Canada in 1892. Others who would later come to Ottawa from provincial legislatures in which they were then sitting were A. G. Blair from New Brunswick and William S. Fielding from Nova Scotia. George Eulas Foster had not in 1880 appeared upon the political scene but five years later he was to be also a member of Macdonald's Cabinet.

\* \* \*

Social movements and changes in the United States during the period under review had important repercussions in Canada. One such movement was the struggle of labour for a larger share in the profits of industry and for a greater measure of security against unemployment and poverty. The panic of 1873 had been followed by the most serious and extensive conflicts of capital and labour that the country had ever known. In the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania during the later 1870's a veritable reign of terror was inaugurated, partly industrial strife and partly private revenge, "a phase of a raw and unrelieved war over the distribution of wealth." Railroad strikes which followed the mining troubles paralysed nearly all the lines east of the Mississippi. Pitched battles were fought in several cities between strikers and militiamen called out to enforce order, while losses of property ran into the millions. Other strikes in the early eighties gave every evidence of a grave economic warfare. Finally in 1886 came the tragic Haymarket Riot in Chicago with its subsequent arrest, trial, and execution of a group of anarchists no one of whom was proven to have been even near the scene of the outrage. All of these developments in the United States were followed with interest in Canada where American labour organization, notably the Knights of Labor, was rapidly spreading its influence. The first Canadian local assembly of the Knights of Labor had been established in Hamilton in 1881. Four years later, when the General Assembly for the United States and Canada met at Hamilton, there were forty-four Canadian locals, thirty-eight of these being in Ontario. Two years later there were 174 Canadian locals, having a membership of 12,553, the high-water mark for Canadian membership. That year saw a general election in Canada and though other issues held the front page of the newspapers both political parties gave an attention to labour issues that has not been paralleled since. Speeches upon labour topics which were prepared for Macdonald's use may be found among his papers in the Public Archives. Blake's labour policies may be read in the collected volume of his speeches which was issued by the Provincial



Reform Association at Toronto.<sup>5</sup> At Toronto, Welland, Belleville, Desoronto, and Hamilton labour was the chief theme of his addresses and the index to the collected speeches has more entries under the word "labour" than under any other heading, not excepting "North-west troubles" and "Canadian Pacific Railway." At Welland Blake's speech was a reply to an address presented to him by the Knights of Labor of that place. Macdonald's speech to the Workingmen's Liberal-Conservative Association and Le Cercle Lafontaine, delivered in Ottawa in October, 1886, and dealing with labour matters, was printed and used as a campaign document. The notes prepared for his speeches include references to the legalization of trades unions, abolition of unwholesome convict labour, and the checking of imported Chinese labour. There was promise also of a bureau of labour statistics. Two labour candidates appeared in Toronto in the election of 1887 but neither was successful.

It is reasonable to conclude that the sudden party interest in labour matters in 1887 was influenced by the peak which labour activity had reached in the United States in 1886. The "Great Upheaval," as it has been termed, was regarded in many quarters as revolutionary in character and in Canada newspaper articles reflected the public interest in American developments. This was particularly true of the *Globe*. In its issue of May 1, 1887, it devoted a whole page to the history of the movement for the eight-hour day, and in the same issue had a lengthy article from the pen of T. V. Powderley, Master Workman of the Knights of Labor. Three weeks later there appeared a symposium on labour problems running to two full pages and similar contributions were printed a week later. A series of five sermons by the Rev. T. de Witt Talmage, the eminent American pulpit orator, on labour issues was a further contribution to the discussion. Henry George visited Canada at the end of 1886 and was heard in the eastern cities, while a year later Canadians in common with Americans turned from the popular writers of the day to Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, of which a Canadian edition soon appeared. There were social stirrings in Canada in 1886 and 1887, though Friedrich Engels when he visited the Dominion in 1888 has recorded that "at first he thought he was back in Europe, but later that he had entered a decaying and retrogressive country . . . ripe for annexation by the United States."<sup>6</sup>

The 1887 election promises of legislation to improve conditions of labour were not new. Factory legislation had been announced in both the sessions of 1883 and 1884, presumably upon the basis of the report made by the Royal Commission on Mills and Factories which had made its investigations during 1881.<sup>7</sup> Shocking conditions had been revealed. The Commissioners experienced considerable difficulty in securing information, in some cases being refused admittance to factories and in other cases being informed by employers "that they knew their own business and that government should not dictate whom they should employ, or interfere in matters of trade." Child labour was found to be extensive and on the increase, the supply being unequal to the de-

<sup>5</sup>*Dominion Election. Campaign of 1887. Speeches of Hon. Edward Blake on the Political Questions of the Day . . .* (Toronto, 1887).

<sup>6</sup>Gustav Mayer, *Friedrich Engels, a biography . . .* (New York, 1936), 294-5.

<sup>7</sup>"Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Working of Mills and Factories in the Dominion, and the Labor Employed Therein" (*Canada, Sessional Papers*, 1882, IX, no. 42).

A.F. JURY  
A.W. W.R.G.



mand. Hours for children were usually the same as for adults while enforced overtime without extra pay added to the strain. Use of child labour was defended on the ground of competition; since some employers used child labour all had to do so or be forced to go out of business. Opposition was also shown to a shorter working day on Saturday on the grounds that it would reduce production and that the workers would use it for dissipation.

Conditions in certain industries were found to be revolting, particularly in the clothing trade where workers were often herded in the lofts of buildings or in low, damp basements with artificial light in use during the whole day. Dangerous machinery was unprotected and steam engines and boilers were found in charge of boys, sometimes only thirteen or fourteen years of age. Ventilation was generally unknown and in some factories closets were used promiscuously by both sexes. Conditions in canning and packing factories were described as, in some cases, "nauseating in the extreme." On the other hand, some of the larger factories and mills were reported to be properly conducted, with attention to the convenience and health of employees.

The Commission in its report commented upon the handicap to their education which resulted from employment of children at a tender age. In Ontario an Act of the Legislature passed in 1874 had provided that every child between the ages of seven and twelve should attend school during four months of the year and had provided penalties for parents or guardians who ignored this regulation. "We were unable to find any place in which this Act is enforced," was the statement of the Commissioners. Other provinces appear to have had no legislation on this matter. Illiteracy was found to be common among adult workers. "In some parts of the country," said the report, "a large proportion are to be found who can neither read nor write."

Five years went by and no action was taken upon this report. Then a new Royal Commission was set to work, its inquiry being more prolonged so that its findings were not received until 1889.<sup>8</sup> Thirty-six places in the four Eastern Provinces were visited and about 1,800 witnesses examined. Child labour was once again found to be widespread and abuses which had not been shown in the earlier report were now laid bare. Instances were discovered of whipping and confinement of child employees while the long hours and unhealthful conditions were seriously affecting the health of juvenile workers. Conditions in the cigar and tobacco factories, which were the larger employers of child labour, were described as of a painful character: "Boys and girls, not more than ten years of age, were found in these places in considerable numbers, and some witnesses not older than fourteen had finished their apprenticeship at cigarmaking and were working as journeymen. The evil in these instances was accentuated by the evident fact that the tobacco had stunted the growth of the witnesses and poisoned their blood. They were under-sized, sallow and listless, wholly without the bright vivacity and rosy hue of health which should animate and adorn children."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>*Report of the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labor and Capital in Canada* (6 vols., Ottawa, 1889).

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, Appendix E, 36.

At one place in Ontario children were found employed around dangerous machinery. Some of these were working for forty-five cents a day from six o'clock in the morning to six o'clock in the evening with less than half an hour for dinner; others worked from seven in the evening until six in the morning. At Montreal young boys were found working all night in a glass works. In the cotton factories, where many children were employed, the hours were from 6.30 A.M. till noon and from 12.45 to 6.15 P.M.—this for five days in the week; on Saturdays the cotton mills closed at noon.

The revelations made by the Royal Commission do not appear to have attracted much public attention, but the government announced at the opening of the session of 1890 that amendments to the labour laws within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada would be submitted. On April 21, the Hon. Thomas White, member for Cardwell, inquired if the promised measures would be introduced during the session then under way and was assured by the Hon. Adolphe Chapleau that the promise of the government would be fulfilled. But the session closed with no such legislation before the House. In the next election loyalty rather than labour was the issue.

\* \* \*

Expansion of missionary enterprise by the larger religious bodies quickly followed the acquisition and opening up of the North-West. This activity formed one of the important religious developments of the period under review. The missionary followed the C.P.R. into the new western settlements, and churches sprang up in the towns that now came into existence. While Presbyterianism, for example, had entered the West as early as 1851, when John Black arrived at Kildonan, it was not until the eighties that Presbyterian missions in Western Canada really got under way. A. B. Baird went overland "with horse and buck board" from Winnipeg to Edmonton in 1881. Angus Robertson reached Calgary with the C.P.R. in 1883. Missions begun at Battleford in 1884, at Medicine Hat in 1885, and at Lethbridge in 1886 marked the further advance of the church. Before the decade ended, Presbyterian missionaries were at all the principal points of settlements in Manitoba and the North-West.<sup>10</sup> Like energy and activity were shown by other church bodies, both Protestant and Catholic, in meeting the challenge of the West, and the publicity which was given to this missionary activity contributed much to making known the resources of the new country. In 1881 the Rev. Alexander Sutherland, of the Methodist Church, made a journey of 6,000 miles overland from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains, on horseback, in wagons, by open boat, and on foot. His narrative was published under the title *A Summer in Prairie Land*. "The most magnificent expanse of virgin soil that remains unsubdued on the face of the earth," was his opinion of the western plains.

Movements directed towards greater unity and more effective consolidation of religious effort also appeared at this time. The Church of England in Canada was moving rapidly during the later eighties towards the National Synod which was established in 1893. It had been impressed upon clergy and laity alike that consolidation of the machinery

<sup>10</sup>J. T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925* (Toronto, 1925), 102.



of the whole church would alone supply the authority, direction, massed effort, and proper apprehension of the general wants of the church and the larger statesmanship required for its missionary work, both at home and abroad. In January, 1887, there was organized at London, Ontario, the Canadian Church Union, designed to promote this ideal, and at a subsequent meeting in April the project was further developed. At Winnipeg in August, 1890, a conference of representatives of the dioceses declared for a general union of the various branches of the Church of England in British North America under a general synod but with the retention of the provinces, and this was brought about three years later.

Methodism, which had achieved a partial union of its several branches in 1874, extended the union in 1883 when practically all Methodist groups in Canada became one.<sup>11</sup> The constituent bodies uniting in 1883 were the Methodist Church of Canada (itself the product of the movement of 1874), the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Primitive Methodist Church, and the Bible Christian Church. Presbyterianism had already achieved union of its several branches by a number of unions during the sixties and by a larger movement in 1875.

Revivalism, which had been such a potent force in Methodism in its pioneer days in Canada, still continued to be the chief agency for adding to the number of adherents. Indeed, in one form or another, revivalism was an agency of all the evangelical Protestant bodies. Dwight L. Moody repeatedly visited Canada during the 1880's and drew great crowds who neither saw nor heard anything of a sensational character but were moved by the same quiet message that had stirred England in 1875 and that had stirred American cities as they had never before been moved by any religious leader. In Canada the Methodist Church had Crossley and Hunter as its most effective revivalist preachers. No less a personage than Sir John Macdonald was a frequent attendant at their meetings in Ottawa during the early months of 1888 and participated with apparent earnestness in the religious exercises. None of Sir John's biographers has mentioned this fact, though the press, particularly the opposition press, gave it plenty of publicity at the time.<sup>12</sup>

The spirit of revivalism even invaded the quiet of Quakerism in Canada and was one of the factors bringing about the split in this body between conservative and more liberal elements. The impact of revivalism in this instance came from two chief sources, from the evangelism of the Society of Friends in the American Middle West, chiefly Indiana, and from Methodism in Canada. The Indiana Friends were frequent visitors to Quaker meetings in Canada and their leanings towards music and singing in the services with other departures from the traditional silence and meditation had far-reaching effect. But the Quakers in Canada faced the ever-present Methodist influence as well

<sup>11</sup>The union of 1874 brought together the Conference of the Maritime Provinces, the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Ontario and Quebec, and the New Connexion Conference to form the new Methodist Church of Canada.

<sup>12</sup>"As to Sir John Macdonald himself, his very hearty and sincere interest in the proceedings is easily evident to any one who watches his face as he sings through with genuine zest such stirring and popular sacred melodies as 'The Lily of the Valley' or 'The Handwriting on the Wall.' It is also true that he has availed himself of the usual opportunities offered for the public manifestation of personal concern, all of which will naturally tend to make the most interesting figure in the recent history of Canada more interesting still in his direction of her business" (*The Week*, March 1, 1888).



and in such localities as Prince Edward County, in Ontario, the Methodist influence unwittingly promoted the unhappy division.<sup>13</sup>

This year marks the sixtieth anniversary of the Salvation Army's first operations in Canada. The work was begun unofficially by members arriving from England, but by 1884 regularly organized corps were to be found in the leading eastern cities. The unusual methods of the Army aroused violent antagonism in some places and an intolerance that is unpleasant to recall. In one city members of the Army were jailed on the charge of disturbing the peace. But persecution brought defenders and critics were gradually won over to become supporters. Goldwin Smith came to the defence of the Army in 1886 in answer to an editorial in the *Week* of which he was a financial supporter. In Quebec City also, when there was marked intolerance shown towards the Salvation Army, Ernest Pacaud, editor of *L'Electeur*, protested vigorously in his newspaper and was warmly commended by Wilfrid Laurier, who wrote: "I congratulate you on your article relative to the Salvation Army. The repeated attacks of a liberal population against this body are unworthy of Quebec City. It is not sufficient that the rioters should be punished; it is necessary that the processions of the Army, ridiculous as they may appear to some, must have full liberty of progress; and if need be I am prepared to march at their head to protect them."<sup>14</sup> The attacks upon the Army brought the reaction which might be expected. Whereas there were no Salvationists recorded in the census of 1881, that of 1891 showed approximately 14,000 adherents. In the succeeding ten years when the Army came to be regarded as "respectable" its numbers fell to 10,300.

These are examples of more visible aspects of religious life in Canada in the 1880's. But more elusive are those movements of thought which, somewhat delayed, affected the theological teaching and preaching of the Protestant bodies. The period was one of revolt against tradition and a time of special activity in Biblical study in America as well as in Europe. The revised version of the *New Testament* and the Westcott and Hort *Greek Testament* were both published in 1881 while work on the revised version of the *Old Testament* was moving forward to its publication in 1885. The *Hebrew Student* first appeared in April, 1882, under the editorship of William Rainey Harper, of the University of Chicago, and more and more critical methods were applied to the study of the Bible. We may, therefore, properly date from 1881 the modern period of Biblical scholarship in America with the historical being substituted for the dogmatic point of view. Von Harnack's monumental *History of Dogma* appeared between 1885 and 1890, stressing the influence of Greek thought on the evolution of Christianity. Von Harnack and other writers had widespread influence upon theological thought at this time, while Mrs. Humphrey Ward brought a new point of view on Christianity to the man in the street in her novel *Robert Elsmere*.

Men of thought within the Canadian churches could not ignore these issues and though some fought vigorously against any departure from the traditional, leaders arose to guide the churches through the trouble-

<sup>13</sup>See A. G. Dorland, *A History of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada* (Toronto, 1927), chaps. XII and XIII.

<sup>14</sup>Lucien Pacaud (ed.), *Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Letters to My Father and Mother* (Toronto, 1935), 28.

some currents. Recent tribute has been paid to Dr. William George Jordan, of Queen's University, as one of those who led "in the struggle to bring the Canadian Church into the strong fresh currents of contemporary thought."<sup>15</sup> It is true that Jordan did not join the Queen's faculty until 1899, a date far beyond the field of this discussion, but his influence upon thought in the churches dated from his arrival in Canada in the late eighties. For many years before he went to Queen's, Jordan had been a frequent visitor at the synods and conferences of his own and other denominations, giving fresh and vigorous Bible teaching. Dr. Nathaniel Micklem has suggested that Jordan more than any other man in Canada "helped to bridge the gulf between the old and the new." But he was not the only one who had made such a contribution. A yet earlier figure was Professor J. F. McCurdy, who became Professor of Oriental Studies in the University of Toronto in 1886, and though unconnected with any theological faculty presented the new views to those students who came under him in their Arts work. The close association of university departments of science with the affiliated Protestant theological colleges in Eastern Canada aided in the harmonizing of new lines of scientific thought and traditional creeds. Such men as Burwash and Coleman in Victoria University made a noteworthy contribution at this time and there were men of their type in the other universities as well.

\* \* \*

Whatever measure or standard may be applied to other aspects of Canadian life during the eighties it will be agreed that in the realm of letters, and in lesser degree, of the arts, this period saw an out-flowering beyond anything previously known. A ten-year period that saw the advent of Roberts, Lampman, Carman, William Wilfred Campbell, Frederick George Scott, Duncan Campbell Scott, and Pauline Johnson must retain for long a distinction in our literary annals. In an instructive essay on this group of writers,<sup>16</sup> J. D. Logan refers to them as the most significant group which has appeared in Canadian literature. They were, he points out, born, bred, and educated in the four provinces which formed the original Dominion. They were the first native-born writers to undertake a systematic literary career. They were also the first Canadian writers to gain recognition both in the United States and in England. It is a happy circumstance that at this time we still have three of this group with us, and that from time to time they express for us the deep emotion of our own days. It is sixty-two years since Sir Charles G. D. Roberts published his *Orion and Other Poems*. In the writer's own copy Sir Charles wrote some years ago: "This my first book, most of which was written when I was about eighteen years of age, has importance in my eyes because Matthew Arnold wrote to me very kindly about it." To Roberts we owe a lasting debt of gratitude because he was privileged to be the literary sponsor of both Lampman and Carman, first introducing them to a Canadian reading public.

The appearance in December, 1883, of the *Week* was a notable event in Canadian literary history. As a journal of comment and criticism

---

<sup>15</sup>W. T. McCree, "William George Jordan" (*Some Great Men of Queen's*, ed. by R. C. Wallace, Toronto, 1941, chap. v). See also Nathaniel Micklem's tribute to Jordan in *Queen's University, a Centenary Volume, 1841-1941* (Toronto, 1941), 105.

<sup>16</sup>*Canadian Magazine*, 1911, 555-63.



we might well be proud were it with us today. It was edited during its first few months by Charles G. D. Roberts, who severed his connection after a prolonged disagreement with Goldwin Smith over the question of annexation to the United States, which Smith favoured. When Roberts retired, the name of C. Blackett Robinson, a part owner and the printer, appeared as editor, but Goldwin Smith exercised some control over policies. The importance of the *Week* lies in the fact that under both Roberts and his successor it introduced to Canadian readers the work of the most outstanding group of writers that we have yet produced. In the first issue, that of December 6, 1883, there was printed a poem by Archibald Lampman, "A Monition," the first product of his pen to appear outside college circles. Three other poems by Lampman were printed during 1884. In December, 1888, the *Week* reviewed Lampman's first volume, *Among the Millet and Other Poems*, according to it high praise and stressing particularly the beauty of the sonnets, "the ripest fruit of Mr. Lampman's talent."

Bliss Carman's work also first appeared in the *Week*, three poems being published before Roberts left the editor's chair. A sketch of Carman was printed in October, 1888, bearing the title "A New Canadian Poet." By this time his work had been accepted by the *Atlantic Monthly*, then under Aldrich, two of his poems having appeared in that magazine, "Low Tide on Grand Pré" and "Carnations in Winter."

During the eighties the *Week* continued to introduce the new group of Canadian poets to its readers by printing examples of their verse and by giving serious reviews to the collected volumes as they appeared. Poems by Duncan Campbell Scott and William Wilfred Campbell were printed in 1889. Scott's first contribution to the *Week* bore the interesting title "Written in a Copy of Archibald Lampman's Poems." By the end of the decade Canadian poets were receiving recognition in the United States and in England. William Sharpe, writing in the *National Review* in 1889 on the sonnet in America, included the work of both Lampman and Roberts in his review.

No important work of imaginative prose literature appeared in Canada during the 1880's but there was a considerable volume of historical writing. John Charles Dent's *The Last Forty Years* was published in 1881 and *The Story of the Canadian Rebellion* in 1885. A reviewer said of the first of these two titles: "It is an evidence that the pulse of national life beats more and more strongly among us, that so many books by Canadian authors on Canadian subjects, and especially upon Canadian history, are finding publishers and readers."<sup>17</sup> This feeling of achievement was also expressed by Sir John Bourinot in his essay on "The Intellectual Development of the Canadian People" which appeared first in the *Canadian Monthly*. Egerton Ryerson's extensive work on the Loyalists was published in 1880 while Kingsford's history of Canada began to appear in the later eighties. Other historical publications of the period were Francis Hincks's *Reminiscences* (1884), Canniff Haight's *Country Life in Canada Fifty Years Ago* (1885), and George Bryce's *History of the Canadian People* (1887). *Picturesque Canada*, which was edited by Principal Grant, dates from 1884. Although begun before the 1880's the continuation of *The Dominion Annual Register* for several years after that date is worthy of record.

<sup>17</sup>*Canadian Methodist Magazine*, XIV, 1881, 191.



Growth of interest in the history of the country was shown also by the publication of such works as Cornish's *Cyclopaedia of Methodism* (1881) and Gregg's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (1885). In Quebec during this period Benjamin Sulte published in six volumes his *Histoire des Canadiens-Français*, a mine of information despite its faulty editing and lack of orderly arrangement. Antoine Gérin-Lajoie's *Dix Ans au Canada, de 1840 à 1850*, was published posthumously in 1888. It has been described by Camille Roy as the best French-Canadian study of the period that witnessed the establishment of responsible government, its information being abundant and accurate and its style temperate and easy. The Abbé Casgrain was also active during this period, his *Pèlerinage au pays d'Évangéline* being crowned by the Académie Française in 1888.

In the field of poetry Louis Fréchette was at the height of his power during the eighties. His poetry is chiefly lyrical. Friendship, the family ties, and nature in its varied moods provide the themes of his verse but like his master Crémazie he was also a patriotic poet. In *La Légende d'un peuple* "he set himself to relate the epic of French Canada—to write in elegant strophes the history of his race." As early as 1880 he was acknowledged by French-Canadians to be their greatest poet and his fame continued to be enhanced thereafter. Other writers whose verse continued to appear during this period were Pamphile Lemay and William Chapman. Like Fréchette Lemay penetrated deeply into the humbler life of his province and he has left unforgettable pictures of the customs and home life of the habitant. Chapman's verse has been described as less sincere and more grandiloquent than that of the writers already mentioned. "What he lacks," says Camille Roy, "is a more constant inspiration, a more fully fledged thought, a less flagging and less wordy versification."

Such progress in music as was recorded during the eighties may chiefly be credited to the churches. Organists, some of them from England, contributed to the elevation of musical taste and in the cities introduced audiences to the works of great composers. Even the annual choir concert in a small town usually brought a special singer or performer to augment the interest of the occasion. In Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Ottawa, Halifax, and Saint John choral societies were to be found during the eighties whose performances were of no mean standard.<sup>18</sup> Dr. F. H. Torrington, of Toronto, was one of the pioneers in this field and in his career of nearly forty years did much to awaken an appreciation of the best in music. Oratorios were the favourite undertakings of the choral societies.

The founding in 1880 of the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts was an indication of the developing consciousness of Canadian achievement. It was modelled upon the Royal Academy of Great Britain and owed much to the support and patronage of the Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise. The charter members whose names were approved by the Governor-General numbered thirteen painters and five architects. They were entitled to bear after their names the letters R.C.A. Among the earliest announced objectives of the Academy was the establishment

---

<sup>18</sup>A review of music in Canada in the *Week* of May 6, 1886, listed the choral societies in Eastern Canada and enumerated the more important works which they had recently performed.

of a national gallery and some steps were taken in this direction as early as 1882. Though it was long after that the idea was carried out we can give due credit to the men who gave it birth.

There was already a notable group of painters in Eastern Canada by 1880, and others whose names are familiar today came to public notice in the next few years. Records of exhibitions and of the activities of art societies make mention of the work of Homer Watson, Horatio Walker, J. W. Morrice, Paul Peel, G. A. Reid, Lucius R. O'Brien, Robert Harris, O. R. Jacobi, F. A. Verner, and William Brymner. In 1886 a collection of Canadian pictures was sent to London and was exhibited at South Kensington. George A. Reid was awarded a medal at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition in that year and Daniel Fowler received a medal and diploma for his work. Although Fowler was born in England he lived during much of his life on Amherst Island near Kingston and his work has been described as having a brilliancy equal to the finest drawings of the best of the modern painters in Europe.

There was more money in circulation in the early eighties than before, enabling people to buy pictures. Hence we find the beginning of some of the important private collections, particularly in Montreal. It was probably in this period that Sir William Van Horne was putting together the nucleus of his famous collection. He was strongly attracted by the newer French school of painting. Other notable private collections in Montreal were beginning to take form in this same period. The Montreal Art Association held annual exhibitions from its formation in 1870 and was building up its own collection during the eighties. A catalogue of its exhibition for 1884 lists the work of such Canadian painters as Brymner, Peel, O'Brien, Verner, Harris, Henry Sandham, and F. M. Bell Smith. Paul Peel had three pictures in this exhibition, one being the familiar "The Young Mother."

Though not founded until 1910 the idea of an Art Museum in Toronto was being discussed as early as 1887. Lucius R. O'Brien announced in February of that year that the Council of the Royal Canadian Academy had granted \$3,000 towards the purchase of a site for a gallery and that a group of artists would contribute a like amount. But the times did not prove favourable to the carrying through of the plan. The Ontario Society of Artists was active, however, and its annual exhibitions from the time of its founding in 1872 did much to stimulate an interest in art in Toronto. Of those working in black and white during the eighties the most conspicuous were J. W. Bengough, cartoonist on the well-known former publication *Grip*, and Henri Julien on whose work Marius Barbeau has recently published a monograph. Julien possessed extraordinary ability and his work has a vitality that has perhaps not since been equalled.

Closely related to the development in the arts was the founding in 1881 of the Royal Society of Canada. This, like the Royal Canadian Academy, owed much in its beginnings to the interest of the Marquis of Lorne. It was intended to promote literature and the sciences throughout the Dominion. Its first volume of *Proceedings* and *Transactions* appeared in 1882.

\* \* \*

The conclusions to be drawn from this paper are few and need be but briefly mentioned. It has not been in any sense a survey of the 1880's

but rather a sampling of a few topics selected from the period, suggesting that midway between Confederation and the turn of the century there lies a period of noticeable transition. Some phases of the transition have been carefully examined by historians—the development of transportation and western land settlement, for example. But we know much less about what might be called the transit of civilization into that western area—the setting up, sometimes under eastern auspices (as in the case of religion), of those institutions which influence, govern, or regulate human relations. We know all too little also of the reaction of this western settlement upon Eastern Canada.

The 1880's witnessed the decline of a great historic party and the gropings of a rival party for policies which would be acceptable to the majority of the people of Canada. What were the actual forces which were producing this disintegration after 1884? Certain familiar explanations have been handed down to us, but are they valid? Furthermore, how much do we actually know about the internal divisions in the Liberalism of the period, how much about the Canada First movement, the Equal Rights Association, D'Alton McCarthy's Third Party, the nationalist movement in Quebec, or the Imperial Federation Movement which for a time found ardent supporters.

The record of the 1880's and what we might term its adjoining decades is not purely contemporary history but it is vitally related to much of our contemporary scene. One of Lord Acton's judgments was that the value of modern history lay in its being "a narrative told of ourselves, the record of a life which is our own, of efforts not yet abandoned to repose, of problems that still entangle the feet and vex the hearts of men." These characteristics may be properly applied to the period which has been dealt with in this paper.



## M. DE LA DAUVERSIÈRE L'HOMME QUI FONDA MONTRÉAL

(RÉSUMÉ DE LA COMMUNICATION PRÉSENTÉE  
PAR M. JEAN BRUCHESI)

TROIS hommes ont fondé Montréal: Olier, Maisonneuve et La Dauversière, mais le premier rang appartient à La Dauversière.

Né en mars 1597, dans la petite ville de La Flèche en Anjou, il appartenait à la petite noblesse. Après ses études chez les Jésuites, il épousa Jeanne de Baugé en 1618, et deux ans plus tard succédait à son père dans la charge de receveur des tailles.

De bonne heure, au milieu d'une rénovation religieuse qui soulevait la France, il commença par s'intéresser à l'Aumônerie Sainte-Marguerite en train de se transformer en hôpital général. Le 2 février 1630, après avoir communiqué, La Dauversière reçut l'inspiration que Dieu lui ordonnait de fonder une congrégation d'hospitalières. L'année suivante, l'inspiration se renouvelera, à laquelle s'ajoutera celle d'établir un hôpital en Canada. En 1634, La Dauversière rencontrait la pieuse Marie de La Ferre, qui lui confiait son dessein de se consacrer aux soins des pauvres et de prendre la direction de l'hôpital qu'il projetait d'établir. Deux ans plus tard, l'évêque d'Angers approuvait la confrérie fondée par La Dauversière en l'honneur de Saint-Joseph et un riche gentilhomme, le baron de Fancamp, fournissait des fonds pour la création d'un Hôtel-Dieu où se dévouait Marie de la Ferre.

Au cours d'un voyage à Meudon, Le Royer fait la rencontre imprévue de M. Olier, qu'il ne connaissait pas et, du coup, les deux hommes se promettent spontanément de travailler en commun à la conversion des Indiens de la Nouvelle-France. Chacun se met à l'œuvre et, dès 1639, La Dauversière obtient, à La Flèche, la reconnaissance civile des Hospitalières de Saint-Joseph et Olier fonde à Paris la Société de Notre-Dame pour l'évangélisation des sauvages de la Nouvelle-France. L'année suivante, La Dauversière et Fancamp obtiennent de son propriétaire, M. de Lauzon, la cession de l'île de Montréal et, sans tarder, ils expédient des outils et des vivres à Québec en vue du prochain établissement. En 1641, La Dauversière s'empresse de recruter des colons; il met à leur tête Maisonneuve, avec Jeanne Mance pour prendre soin des malades et des blessés. En juin 1641, l'expédition se met en route pour la Nouvelle-France.

Montréal fondé, La Dauversière s'occupera pendant les huit ans qui suivent de trouver les fonds nécessaires à l'existence du poste montréalais. Il ne perdra jamais de vue son premier projet d'installer des Hospitalières de Saint-Joseph dans un Hôtel-Dieu à Montréal. L'ordre est d'abord reconnu en France, mais M. de Queylus et Mgr de Laval cherchent à établir à Ville-Marie les hospitalières de Québec. Ensuite, l'évêque d'Angers et même la population de La Flèche s'opposent au départ des hospitalières choisies pour aller au Canada. Finalement, l'embarquement de trois hospitalières de La Flèche s'accomplit le 2 juillet 1659 et cette même année elles ouvrent l'Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal.

Six mois plus tard, le 6 novembre 1659, La Dauversière meurt, ayant accompli son œuvre d'établir une colonie dans l'île de Montréal et un Hôtel-Dieu d'Hospitalières de Saint-Joseph à Ville-Marie.

## THE EVOLUTION OF MONTREAL UNDER THE FRENCH REGIME

By E. R. ADAIR  
*McGill University*

THE city of Montreal stands on an island in the River St. Lawrence, some thirty miles long and ten miles broad, the largest of a very considerable group of islands which block the entrance of the Ottawa River into the main stream. Of these only three others are of any size, the Ile Perrot, the Ile Bizard, and the Ile Jésus, the latter lying between the Island of Montreal and the north shore of the river. In consequence, it may fairly be said that the Ottawa, which has been in the past one of the main routes to the North-West and the Great Lakes, flows into the St. Lawrence through four channels: one of little value, to the west of the Ile Perrot; another between the Ile Perrot and the Island of Montreal which, though interrupted by a small rapid, has always been part of the main trade route up the Ottawa; a third, the Rivière des Prairies, between the Ile Jésus and the Island of Montreal; this, though also interrupted by rapids, has been regularly used by both canoes and lumber rafts; and a fourth between the Ile Jésus and the mainland which contains many small islands and has never been of much value for navigation. Thus Montreal stands not only on the trade route up the St. Lawrence, but also at the beginning of that up the Ottawa. Furthermore, it lies at the head of navigation on the St. Lawrence itself, for just above it are the Lachine Rapids which have always been an insuperable obstacle even for canoes. Finally, only a few miles to the south of Montreal is the valley of the Richelieu which leads to Lake Champlain, to the country of the Iroquois, and to the great trade route along the Hudson River running down to the sea at New York.

The first white man to reach the spot where Montreal now stands was Jacques Cartier who, in his account of his second voyage, describes how on Saturday, October 2, 1535 he landed there in order to visit the Indian village of Hochelaga, a short distance inland; on his way he observed that, as he says, "The country was the finest and most excellent one could find anywhere" and as they approached the village "the land began to be cultivated. It was fine land with large fields covered with the corn of the country"; and adjacent to the village lay a mountain which Cartier named "Mount Royal."<sup>1</sup>

Jacques Cartier was an explorer not a colonist, and however much he may have admired the country, he did nothing more than survey its rolling forests from the top of Mount Royal.<sup>2</sup> For nearly seventy years it was hidden from the eye of the white man and then in July, 1603 came Samuel de Champlain, only to find that Hochelaga had vanished before the fear of attack by hostile Indians. He also admired the land; he found, to quote his own words, that "the climate there is milder and more

---

<sup>1</sup>H. P. Biggar, *The Voyages of Jacques Cartier* (Publications of the Public Archives of Canada, no. 11, 1924), 152-4. There is no good evidence to support the view of M. Beaugrand-Champagne that Hochelaga lay on the other side of the island near the Rivière des Prairies (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1923); see the article by M. Lanctot on this subject (*ibid.*, 1930, sect. I, 115-41).

<sup>2</sup>Biggar, *Voyages of Jacques Cartier*, 168-9.



equable, and the soil better than in any place I had seen, with trees and fruit in great quantity."<sup>3</sup> And Champlain also notes what was to prove one of the great disadvantages of the site of the future Montreal—the St. Mary's current that still rushes along the shore past St. Helen's Island, just opposite the city, and does not fade into the even flow of the river for several miles: "although we had the wind very favorable," he writes, "yet we could not with all our might make any great way."<sup>4</sup> And again on his second visit he notices regretfully that to this spot "pinnaces and shallows can ascend easily . . . only with a strong wind, or by going a round about way, on account of the strong current."<sup>5</sup>

Champlain was more than a mere explorer, he was looking for a suitable place where a post might be established in order to maintain contact with the Indians; hence his second journey to the Island of Montreal in May, 1611. On this occasion he wandered over the whole countryside and, as he says, "having examined very carefully and found this spot to be one of the finest on the river, I ordered the trees of the Place Royale to be cut down and cleared off, in order to level the ground and make it ready for building. Water can be made to encircle the place very easily, and a little island formed of it, on which to erect such an establishment as one may wish. Some twenty yards from the Place Royale lies a small island about a hundred yards long, where a good strong dwelling might be built. There are also many level stretches of a very good rich potter's clay for brickmaking and building, which is a great convenience."<sup>6</sup> What Champlain named the Place Royale is the small triangular piece of land formed by the entrance of the little river St. Pierre<sup>7</sup> into the St. Lawrence, and later to be known as the Pointe-à-Callières. It is extremely interesting to notice how Champlain's trained intelligence observed almost all the advantages and disadvantages that were to mark the early development of Montreal: the strong current that made access to it difficult for sailing ships and rowboats alike; the pleasant land which the Indians had cleared and where, as he said, "one might sow grain and do gardening," and on June 2 he did sow some seeds and watched them come up with perfect success; the fruit that was to be found in profusion—plums, cherries, strawberries, vines, nuts; the abundance of fish and game-birds;<sup>8</sup> the facilities for building; the danger from floods, a danger that he feared so much that he had an experimental wall built—"to see how it would last during the winter when the waters came down"<sup>9</sup>—though he thought the land was high enough to prevent disaster; the strategic position where Indians would naturally pause after their struggle with the rapids on the Ottawa or the St. Lawrence; here again his judgment was sound for he had been on the island only a few days when Indians actually began to arrive, anxious to exchange furs for the treasures of the white men. And finally he fully realized that the place must be easy to defend and in his anxiety to make certain of this, he even went so far as to suggest building his strong town on St.

---

<sup>3</sup>H. P. Biggar, *The Works of Samuel de Champlain* (Champlain Society, 1922-36), I, 152-3.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, I, 148.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 175-6.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 177-9.

<sup>7</sup>The river St. Pierre ran down along the line of the modern William Street.

<sup>8</sup>Biggar, *Works of Champlain*, II, 176-7.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, 178-9.



Helen's Island in the middle of the St. Lawrence.<sup>10</sup> But all this forethought proved useless; Champlain certainly returned in 1613, but nothing was built<sup>11</sup> and Montreal was to lie desolate for another thirty years. Yet his eulogies were not altogether wasted, for the account of his second voyage was published in 1613 and was almost certainly the narrative that inspired the actual founders of Montreal with a determination, as Dollier de Casson wrote thirty years later, to convert the Indians by establishing there "a fine French colony which could give the natives a taste for a more civilised life."<sup>12</sup>

On December 17, 1640, the Company of New France, commonly known as the Company of One Hundred Associates, granted the greater part of the Island of Montreal to Pierre Chevrier, Sieur de Fancamp, and to Jérôme le Royer, Sieur de la Dauversière;<sup>13</sup> these two were acting on behalf of a group of men who, under the title of "Messieurs les associés pour la conversion des Sauvages de la Nouvelle-France en L'Ile de Montréal," were proposing to establish a small colony on the island.<sup>14</sup> The rest of the island was granted to them on April 21, 1659, and on March 9, 1663 they handed over all their rights to the Seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris.<sup>15</sup> But long before this, the first settlement had been made and the town of Montreal founded. In 1641 a small band of about fifty settlers had been sent out under the leadership of Paul de Chomedy, Sieur de Maisonneuve. They reached Quebec late in the season; a fresh war had just broken out with the Iroquois, and the officials at Quebec painted their future, if they persisted, in the blackest possible colours. Therefore Maisonneuve contented himself with a mere reconnaissance, reaching the Island of Montreal on October 15, 1641 in company with the Governor of New France, M. de Montmagny.<sup>16</sup> He returned to Quebec a few days later, spent the winter there and in the following spring led his little band, now about fifty-four strong, up the St. Lawrence.<sup>17</sup> On May 17, 1642 he took formal possession of the land the company had granted. His companion, Jeanne Mance, describes how, as soon as he had disembarked, he "threw himself upon his knees to adore God in that savage place, and all his company with him."<sup>18</sup> Father Vimont, who accompanied the expedition, chanted the *Veni Creator*, said Mass, and exposed the Blessed Sacrament.<sup>19</sup> Jeanne Mance, from

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 252-4.

<sup>12</sup>"Une belle colonie Française qui leur pouvait faire sucer un lait moins barbare" (Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, ed. R. Flenley, Toronto, 1928, 62).

<sup>13</sup>*Edits, Ordonnances Royaux* (Quebec, 1854), I, 20-3.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 26-7.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 29-30, 93-7.

<sup>16</sup>R. G. Thwaites (ed.), *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1876-1901), XXII, 211-13, "Relation of 1642 by Rev. Father Vimont"; Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 89-93.

<sup>17</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, "Les colons de Montréal, 1642-1667" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1913, sect. I, 4).

<sup>18</sup>Morin, *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu* (Société historique de Montréal, 1921), XII, 61.

<sup>19</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, XXII, 211-13. Morin in "Le Date de la fondation de Montréal" (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1936, 362-72, 396-410) maintains that probably the landing was made on May 18 and not on May 17, and that certainly the mass was said on May 18; his arguments appear quite unsound and are largely the result of following a baseless hypothesis first put forward by Faillon that Maisonneuve reached merely the lower end of the island and not the site of Montreal on May 17. The case for May 17 as the correct date for the foundation of Montreal is admirably put by A. Saint Pierre in his article "Le 17 ou le 18" (*Report of the Canadian Historical Association*, 1936, 109-114).

whose memory the events of those first few days could never have faded, tells a charming story of how, some days later, after they had built their little square chapel, they had no oil for a lamp; and so fireflies were set in a glass vial before the Sacrament and they shone "as clearly and as brightly throughout the night as if there had been several little candles alight within."<sup>20</sup> The settlers had landed on the spot that Champlain had cleared and named the Place Royale; the protection afforded by the St. Lawrence and its little tributary, the St. Pierre, appealed strongly to them and there they set to work to erect a stockade to enclose the few simple houses that were to lodge the whole colony and the primitive chapel built of bark in which they were to worship. On July 28 a small party of Algonquins appeared, and their chieftain brought his son, aged four, to be baptised—the first convert to be made by the new colonists; the relationship between Frenchman and Indian is here not yet one of trade, but of missionary enterprise.<sup>21</sup>

Three hundred years later it is difficult to speak with certainty as to the motives that animated any group of men, for the reasons alleged in grants and charters do not necessarily tell the whole truth, but all the evidence that survives goes to show that the "Messieurs . . . pour la conversion des Sauvages" lived up to their name, and throughout were inspired by religious motives and by religious motives alone. When Father Vimont sets out to explain the reasons for the choice of Montreal as the site of their settlement he, like Champlain, certainly describes its natural advantages, how it "gives access and an admirable approach to all the Nations of this vast country . . . so that, if peace prevailed among these peoples they would land thereon from all sides"; but does he suggest, as Champlain does, that this will provide a profitable trade? Not at all, for he goes on to speak of the motives of the colonists: "Their intention is to have houses built in which to lodge the savages, to till the soil in order to feed them; to establish seminaries for their instruction and an Hôtel-Dieu for succouring their sick."<sup>22</sup> There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of all this, though the purity of their religious philanthropy was of short duration: it is significant that, when Dollier de Casson—also, let it be noted, an ecclesiastic—is writing only thirty years later of the physical advantages which led its founders to the site of Montreal, he unconsciously reveals the change in public opinion when he speaks enthusiastically of its "Convenience for trade . . . there is no doubt that the spot is one of the best in the country for the inhabitants, because of the trade they can do there with the savages who come down the river in canoes thereto, from all the nations living higher up."<sup>23</sup>

If I have described at undue length the earliest days of the settlement, it has been with the view of showing the very real religious feelings that animated its original settlers. Of course this state of things did not last: the prospect of wealth from trading in furs soon led some of them to season piety with profits; the pressing need for new colonists to recruit the declining strength of the settlement led to the bringing out of anyone who would consent to come; his motives were not important if his arms

<sup>20</sup>Morin, *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu*, 63.

<sup>21</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, XXII, 213-15; Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 97-101; Morin, *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu*, 63-4.

<sup>22</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, XXII, 207-9.

<sup>23</sup>Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 101.



were strong. But to the moment of his forced retirement in 1665 from the position of Governor of Montreal, all are agreed as to the simplicity of life and disregard of profit on the part of their leader, Maisonneuve. "His disinterestedness was so perfect," writes Mère Juchereau, "that he never appropriated to himself the least thing from among the considerable presents that the savages gave him; he distributed them all to the soldiers of his garrison and to the inhabitants of the town."<sup>24</sup> And Sœur Morin bears witness to the fact that he might have made a large fortune by a perfectly honest trade in beaver skins, but he had no care for such things.<sup>25</sup> Therefore it is not unfair to claim that Montreal was founded as the result of religious motives alone, and that the first inhabitants were, in the main, induced to settle there by similar motives rather than by any hope of profit. It is worth emphasizing this, not only because Montreal is the only large town in North America that has originated in this manner, but also because it shows how dangerous is the study of economic and physical environment if it be divorced from the parallel study of historical evidence. In the case of Montreal, such a superficial view would inevitably have led one to the conclusion that its foundation was the result of its admirable position in regard to the Indian trade and, as I have shown, this was by no means the case.

It has always been asserted or at least implied by modern writers that the purity of the earlier days began to vanish with the sending to Montreal in 1665 of the Carignan-Salières Regiment in order that the country might be more adequately protected from Iroquois raiders. This, however, is hardly the case. If Maisonneuve resisted the lure of trade with the Indians and the profits that it brought, the same cannot be said of his followers. Fresh settlers were arriving and, unless they were professional ecclesiastics, it was very rarely spiritual motives that drove them across the Atlantic. Jacques Le Ber, for example, may stand high in French-Canadian annals for his piety, but he was a merchant and a fur trader, who intrigued and struggled to maintain his grip upon the more profitable parts of the business that flowed through Montreal, a successful *parvenu* who was certainly given letters of nobility by Louis XIV in 1696, but who paid 6000 livres to get them.<sup>26</sup> Or to instance another leading member of this little community in the second half of the seventeenth century: Charles Le Moyne was the son of an innkeeper at Dieppe, who early learnt the ways and the language of the Indians, and who had his house and shop in the rue St. Paul, the earliest street to be built in Montreal, running back of the common land along the shore of and parallel with the St. Lawrence. There he transacted a very profitable business with the citizens, and there he stored the furs he bought from the Indians, but as early as 1657 he was acquiring large stretches of land on the opposite side of the river and by 1672 he had built up the great Seigneurie of Longueuil. He was ennobled in 1668, but it was not until after his death—he died in February, 1685—that the title of Baron de Longueuil was conferred upon his son Charles, to whom he had left his seigneurie.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Mère Juchereau, *Histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec*, 124-5, quoted by Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada* (Paris, 1865-6), III, 111-12.

<sup>25</sup>Morin, *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu*, 79-80.

<sup>26</sup>Faillon, *Vie de Mlle le Ber*, 319-22, 325.

<sup>27</sup>Jodoin and Vincent, *Longueuil*, 7, 20, 34-5, 41-9, 72, 76, 77; W. B. Munro, *Documents relating to Seigniorial Tenure in Canada*, 66-9; *Archives de Québec: Lettres de noblesse*, I, 264-7; *Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1915, 48.



Certainly as early as 1669 Le Ber and Le Moyne were acting in co-operation, for in that year they acquired the farm that had been held by the explorer La Salle, and which was situated at Lachine, just west of Montreal and above the rapids.<sup>28</sup> This co-operation they continued when they purchased jointly in 1679 the fief later named Senneville lying at the extreme west end of the Island of Montreal. They held this until 1683 when, upon an agreement to dissolve their loose partnership, Le Ber acquired it as his share of the common possessions.<sup>29</sup> It was no accident, however, that Le Moyne almost immediately purchased for a song the Ile Perrot lying still a little farther to the west.<sup>30</sup>

What is the significance of all this in the development of Montreal? It is to be found in the fact that it is part of a general competitive movement to skim the cream from the fur trade by anticipating the Montreal market. A sort of fair was held in Montreal in the late spring of each year to which the Indians were accustomed to resort in very considerable numbers; they set up their little cabins on the strand; and at first in the old market place, the Place Royale, and later even along the stockaded wall the merchants of the town set out their goods in booths and bargained for furs.<sup>31</sup> It was obvious, however, that if some enterprising trader could catch the Indians before they reached Montreal and listened to the ever-increasing offers of his competitors, he could lure the unsuspecting savages into some wonderful bargains. That is just what Le Ber and Le Moyne were doing when they went to Lachine; others soon followed, therefore they pushed a little further west, along the route the Indians must follow on their journey down to Montreal. Soon there was along the shore of the St. Lawrence west of the city a whole row of these fur traders, disguised as seigneurs if they were big men, as farmers if they were small ones. The real example for this policy had, however, been set not by a merchant but by a royal official, Perrot, the Governor of Montreal, whose henchman, René Cuillerier, had settled at Lachine, as early as 1670, and who in October, 1672, had himself gained the grant of the island which now bears his name, the Ile Perrot, solely in order to establish a post there under his lieutenant, de Brucy, with a view to purchasing the best furs at the cheapest rates.<sup>32</sup> And even Frontenac, the Governor of New France, was not above taking a hand in the game: in 1673 he built Fort Cataraqui which tapped the fur trade down the St. Lawrence and so anticipated the Montreal merchants, even though it left untouched the very valuable business that came down the Ottawa. As Perrot had outplayed Le Ber and Le Moyne, so Frontenac overreached Perrot; and it is interesting to note that Le Ber, who in 1673 was on the side of Frontenac against Perrot, had hoped to obtain the fur monopoly at Fort Cataraqui. When this was given to La Salle, who had long worked with Frontenac, Le Ber at once became his bitter trade rival, no doubt now regarding Frontenac

<sup>28</sup>Girouard, *Lake St. Louis*, 15.

<sup>29</sup>Faillon, *Vie de Mlle le Ber*, 319-22.

<sup>30</sup>Jodoin and Vincent, *Longueuil*, 80.

<sup>31</sup>"Extrait d'un mémoire sur le Canada adressé au Comte du Pontchartrain par le Roy de la Potherie" in Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, V, 185-6; Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage fait . . . dans l'Amérique septentrionale* (1744), 142-3 (this is vol. III of his *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*); *Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Gouverneurs et Intendants, 1639-1706*, II, 14-16.

<sup>32</sup>Girouard, *Lake St. Louis*, 43, 208-11; Quebec Archives, Régistre d'Intendance, no. 1, fo. 5.

as a much more dangerous competitor than Perrot, for Perrot's imprisonment by Frontenac in 1674 was not wholly unconnected with the appearance of the latter in the Montreal fur trade.<sup>33</sup> So there emerge in Montreal in the seventies and the eighties hostile fur-trading cliques, rivals not only in anticipating the Montreal market, but also for the control of posts that were being built up country and for the profits of the direct trade with the Indian settlements by means of *coureurs de bois*; to this last development reference will be made later.

It was natural that this anticipation of the Montreal fur market should be called to the attention of the Intendant. In February, 1683, the intercepting of Indian or other fur traders on their way down to Montreal was forbidden by ordinance, and this prohibition was repeated in May, 1685, and again in August, 1685, though it looks as though a few of the larger men like Le Ber and Le Moyne had been using some of their considerable influence to obtain preferential treatment, for seigneurs were to be allowed to entertain and have commerce with the Indians on their seigneuries as often as they pleased.<sup>34</sup> Even as late as May, 1708, this same prohibition was repeated,<sup>35</sup> but it never seems to have been very effective. Time, however, brought its revenges, and in 1701 M. de la Potherie reported that "there was trouble in Montreal among the merchants, who were in despair at this establishment [a post at Detroit]"; among others "M. Le Ber, the richest trader in the country . . . cried out against this experiment."<sup>36</sup> He was being beaten at his own game.

What does this mean? It is really the symbol of a great change in the economic position of Montreal. We have seen how in early days the Indians came down every year to sell their furs in the fair between the settlement and the shore of the river. But competition to this straightforward business was rapidly growing and this competition to forestall trade rivals and purchase furs at bargain rates was not limited merely to the gradual westward movement which I have already described. Habitants, dissatisfied with the laborious round of their daily lives, left their farms and ranged the woods as *coureurs de bois*, trading with the Indians and so tapping the fur trade, as it were, at its source. And this development was not merely the result of individual restlessness; it was caused by necessity. The destruction of the Hurons by the Iroquois in 1649-50, the cutting of the trade routes down the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa by their raiding parties, killed the fur trade. Father Le Mercier, writing in 1663, said, "For a year the warehouse of Montreal has not bought a single Beaver skin from the savages." If the Indians could not come to Montreal, Montreal must go to the Indians. "All our young Frenchmen are planning to go on a trading expedition, to find the Natives that are scattered here and there; and they hope to come back laden with the Beaverskins of several years accumulation."<sup>37</sup> *Coureurs de bois* set forth more vigorously than ever before, to save the newly established *Compagnie des Habitants* from

<sup>33</sup>E. Wardleworth, "François-Marie Perrot" (thesis for M.A. at McGill), 84-7, 101-4, 122, 146, 180-5.

<sup>34</sup>*Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Gouverneurs et Intendants, 1639-1706*, II, 14-16, 107-8, 122-3.

<sup>35</sup>*Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Intendants*, I, 57.

<sup>36</sup>"Extrait d'un mémoire . . . par le Roy de la Potherie" printed in Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, V, 181.

<sup>37</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, XL, 211-15.



complete collapse. Moreover, as early as 1673 the Hudson Bay Company was also tapping the source of fur, for it was easier and more profitable for the western Indians to take their beaver skins to Fort Albany or Fort Moose on James Bay than to the distant Montreal; the only way for the French merchants to meet this threat was to send out *coureurs de bois* to trade with the Indians in their settlements, or to establish French posts in the up-country that would provide the Indian with a market close at hand and so persuade him not to visit the English, even though they paid more for his beaver skins and gave him goods that he liked better. Both these expedients were adopted, and with success.<sup>38</sup>

Merchants in Montreal, seeing the possibilities offered by the *coureurs de bois*, sought out men who wished to combine profit with adventure, and hired them to procure furs, sometimes on a wage basis, more often probably, on a loose understanding, by which they sold their furs to the merchant at a specially cheap rate and the merchant possibly provided some of their equipment in return—a sort of profit-sharing system. Before very long, it became common for the merchant who had secured a *congé* to trade, to supply the goods for barter and to take half the profits, the *voyageurs* sharing the other half among themselves.<sup>39</sup>

To all this both government and church objected very strongly; ordinances were issued,<sup>40</sup> the Intendant Duchesneau was especially bitter against this practice but, as he says, "I have enacted ordinances against the *Coureurs de bois*; against the merchants who furnish them with goods; against the gentlemen and others who harbour them. . . . All that has been in vain, in as much as several of the most considerable families in this country are interested therein."<sup>41</sup> It was felt that all this wandering unsettled the habitants, gave them wrong ideas when they ought to be content to live peaceful lives and clear the land and till their farms, even that, as Duchesneau complains, "their absence gave rise to licentiousness among their wives";<sup>42</sup> it was feared also that it might disorganize the fur trade, that sooner or later it would teach the Indians the possibility of buying in a cheap market and selling in a dear one, for it showed them how much their furs were coveted. Charlevoix, writing in 1721, complains of the avidity of the *coureurs de bois* which "has lowered the price of our commodities and raised that of their peltry."<sup>43</sup> And it might even lead Indians and *coureurs* alike to play Dutch or English off against French, to seek the higher price offered at Orange

<sup>38</sup>G. de T. Glazebrook, *History of Transportation in Canada*, 14, 22-4.

<sup>39</sup>*Mémoire par Nicholas Perrot*, ed. R. P. J. Tailhan (1864), 297-9, quoting from "Mémoire historique sur les mauvais effets de la réunion des castors dans une même main" addressed to the Comte de Pontchartrain in 1705; Bacqueville de la Potherie, *Histoire de l'Amérique septentrionale* (1753), II, 142. Later on, in the eighteenth century, the merchant's profit was reckoned to be about 30 per cent. In the seventeenth century the term "*coureurs de bois*" was applied loosely and generally to all Frenchmen who were ready to seek the Indians in order to obtain furs. In later years it tended to be restricted to illegal traders and private adventurers, and men working for or with merchants were called "*voyageurs*" and "*engagés*," the "*voyageur*" being the man in charge of a canoe and the "*engagés*" being the paddlers; but right to the end of the French régime these three terms were often confused.

<sup>40</sup>E.g., on Jan 20, 1703 (*Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Gouverneurs et Intendants*, 1639-1706, II, 315-16).

<sup>41</sup>E. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, IX, 131-3, Duchesneau to M. de Seignelay, Nov. 10, 1679.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup>Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage . . . dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, 143.



or elsewhere in the Hudson valley.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, some of the Montreal merchants themselves were not above securing greater profits by sending their furs to the English instead of to France.<sup>45</sup>

This was the government's side of the case; what had the Catholic Church to say? She saw in the ventures of the *coureurs de bois* after furs a desperate blow at her whole Indian policy which was based upon an attempt to keep the white men away from the natives. Not only did the white men tend to adopt Indian ways, to take Indian wives without benefit of clergy and to fail in proper reverence to the church, but they taught the white men's vices to the Indians, and especially did they take them brandy to barter for furs. It was bad enough that the Indians could procure strong drink in Montreal where its sale might be controlled, though, as we shall see later, even in enforcing this control the church failed, but that it should be smuggled into the Indian villages was anathema. Here the government and the chief officials and merchants did not always see eye to eye with the church: at any cost they wanted to control the fur trade; brandy was undoubtedly the best lure for the Indians that they knew; therefore in its fight against Indian drunkenness the church never really had any constant lay support. And indeed the church itself was faced, as was pointed out in 1678, with the unpleasant alternative of giving the Indians brandy and the true faith in New France, or leaving them to be attracted to the English settlement where they would imbibe heresy with their rum. This so-called Brandy Parliament of 1678 is worthy of some attention, for it shows the economic position of the Indian trade to a nicety. The church wants prohibition of all sale of brandy to the Indians on moral grounds; the government is torn between the conflicting claims of morality and trade, and compromises in the ordinance of May 22, 1683, when people are forbidden to carry brandy to the west end of the Island of Montreal to sell there to the savages on their way down stream "in order to try and make them drunk and so overreach them in trading with them,"<sup>46</sup> as the ordinance says. The big Montreal merchants want to prevent their rivals, the *coureurs de bois*, from selling strong drink, but desire to be allowed to sell it themselves in Montreal and so maintain the flow of furs uninterruptedly to the island; all the others want unrestricted sale.<sup>47</sup> Soon, however, as we have seen, these differences were reconciled: the church continued to fight, but the government lent it little real support, while the merchants themselves employed more and more canoemen, fur traders, voyageurs, and the government recognized the situation by issuing *congés* or permissions to trade up country to those prepared to pay for them. Although the granting of these *congés* was abolished in 1696, a limited number was allowed between 1716 and 1719, and from 1726 onwards their grant became usual once more, as the conditions of the fur trade had so changed as to render them necessary.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup>O'Callaghan, *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, IX, 408-9, "Differences in the Indian Trade between Montreal and Orange 1689."

<sup>45</sup>Girouard, *Lake St. Louis*, 208-9; Report by Gédéon de Catalogne (Nov. 7, 1712) printed in Munro, *Documents relating to Seigniorial Tenure*, 98; Jean Lunn, "The Illegal Fur Trade out of New France, 1713-1760" (*Report of the Canadian Historical Association*, 1939, 61-76).

<sup>46</sup>*Archives de Québec: Ordonnance des Gouverneurs et Intendants, 1639-1706*, II, 37-8.

<sup>47</sup>W. B. Munro, "The Brandy Parliament" (*Canadian Historical Review*, II, 172-89).

<sup>48</sup>I. Caron, *La Colonisation du Canada*, 76.

What was the effect of these developments on Montreal? By the end of the seventeenth century the economic situation had defined itself. The Indians were no longer coming to Montreal to sell their furs; as Charlevoix said in 1721 after describing the past glories of the fur fair, "There are still now and then companies or rather flotillas of Indians arriving at Montreal, but nothing in comparison with what used to resort hither."<sup>49</sup> Instead, such furs as reached the city were being purchased by coureurs, by merchants, or by officers of the Crown. Between 1670 and 1760 nearly fourteen thousand men made contracts at Montreal alone to go trading for furs in the backwoods with the Indians.<sup>50</sup> But even so, it was felt that the trade was not nearly as great as it ought to have been: the Iroquois wars interfered with it seriously; English competition was growing very rapidly, not only because the Iroquois were trying to act as middlemen for the western Indians and divert the trade through their lands to the English in the Mohawk and Hudson valleys, but also because the Indians liked the English cloth that they received in exchange—the "strouds" and the "scarlets"—better than they did the French; and above all the English gave higher prices for the furs. They could do this, since they appear to have realized better than did the French, the advantages of smaller but more frequent profits, and also because the French goods were actually dearer to the French merchants in consequence of the great discount on the Canadian card money;<sup>51</sup> they were even a good deal dearer in Montreal than they were in Quebec.<sup>52</sup>

Consequently by about 1700 Montreal economically was no longer a town of small traders, of fur fairs and Indian barter, but a city of merchants, a base for adventures into the wilds, even a city of bright lights to which Indians and voyageurs alike came to drink and gamble away their profits. Moreover, the way had already been prepared for the final stage under the French régime—the setting up of military posts up country. At first these might have been established as a defence against hostile Indians, but almost at once the economic factor became important; not only was there a desire to hold trade routes against the competition of the English and their Indian allies, but the French were anxious to impress the Indians with their value as friends, and to establish posts to which furs might be more easily brought and from which traders might cover the surrounding country. Hence the alarm of Le Ber and other leading merchants at the establishment of Detroit which I mentioned above. It looked as though, with the penetration westward, the merchants of Montreal would lose their splendid profits unless they could send up canoes with goods and agents to gather in the furs at the western posts.

Nor was this all. From the very beginning the officers of the Crown in New France had done a good deal of private trading with the Indians. We have seen how Perrot, the Governor of Montreal, used his position, and even the officers under him, to set up a trading post on Ile Perrot. "He is ruining the country and its trade, he carries on business publicly,

<sup>49</sup>Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage . . . dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, 142-3.

<sup>50</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, *Auberges et cabarets d'autrefois*, 108-9.

<sup>51</sup>Report of Gédéon de Catalogne of Nov. 7, 1712, printed in Munro, *Documents relating to Seigniorial Tenure*, 149.

<sup>52</sup>In 1743 prices were 25 per cent higher in Montreal than in Quebec; see letter from Varin, printed in H. A. Innis, *Select Documents in Canadian Economic History*, 413.



he even possesses a shop on the common," says an indignant memoir of 1681, probably written by the Intendant Duchesneau,<sup>53</sup> "He authorises his servants and his soldiers to carry on the fur trade in the camps of the Indians. He forces them to sell him their furs and the people of the colony get only what is left." His activities cut into the profits of the private trade that Frontenac, the Governor of New France, was also carrying on, though in a slightly more respectable manner, and hence bitter strife arose between them with the result that Perrot was ultimately disgraced. In this struggle the Montreal merchants took sides with a view to increasing their profits at the expense of their government competitors; one finds, for instance, Le Moyne and Le Ber intriguing to oust the explorer La Salle from his trading posts, because La Salle was supported by Frontenac,<sup>54</sup> and there can clearly be discerned at least two constantly shifting groups of trading rivals in Montreal, fighting for control of the fur trade, fighting for spheres of influence among the tribes of the new west. In 1685 Denonville writes plaintively about Tonty and La Salle who were Frontenac's protégés and therefore Denonville's enemies: "I am told that M. de Tonty will not allow our Frenchmen to trade in the Illinois country. If the King has given to M. de La Salle the land all for himself, it would be desirable that I should be told about it, so that I may carry out the orders of his Majesty."<sup>55</sup> But before very long a variety of posts were being set up in the west, each under a military officer whose nominal business was the command of the small garrison and the protection of French interests and French traders. In fact, however, in most cases he rapidly became the bitter rival of the private trader. He used his official position not only to hamper his competitors, but to bully the Indians into letting him have the best furs at the cheapest rates. In 1752 Franquet, who was sent out to New France as royal inspector of forts and other military works, complained bitterly that these officers were so busy making their fortunes by trade that they neglected their military duties and "There are very few of them who do not set up a trading shop . . . when they are sent off to their posts."<sup>56</sup> Pouchot writing a little later says there are only three sorts of Indian trade: the king's official trade, that done by his officers at various lesser posts, and that of the coureurs de bois who adventure into the Indian villages and might do very well if they could afford to purchase goods at first hand.<sup>57</sup>

Therefore by the end of the French régime the economic position of Montreal has again completely changed. It is no longer the place of exchange with the Indians for their furs; the period of simple barter on the part of the ordinary citizen to whose doorstep, as it were, the Indian brought his furs has come completely to an end. It is not even the place from which adventurous coureurs de bois can set out to make great profits. The fur trade has, from Montreal's point of view, become a highly organized business. It still, of course, gives a livelihood to many small

<sup>53</sup>Quoted in C. Bertrand, *Histoire de Montréal*, from Archives de la Marine, Collection Moreau St. Méry, Mémoires fo. 76.

<sup>54</sup>Atherton, *History of Montreal*, I, 273-4.

<sup>55</sup>Denonville to Seignelay, Sept. 13, 1685, quoted in Tailhan (ed.), *Mémoire par Nicholas Perrot*, 303.

<sup>56</sup>Franquet, *Voyages et mémoires sur le Canada* (Québec, 1889), 29-30, 56.

<sup>57</sup>Pouchot, *Memoirs upon the Late War in North America between the French and English, 1755-60*; quoted by Atherton, *History of Montreal*, I, 372-5.



men: canoemen, agents, and the like; those connected with the provisioning and equipping of the up-country posts, of the voyages made in the interests of big merchants or of the Company of the Indies; in that sense Franquet in 1752 can still say that all the inhabitants of Montreal are concerned in the trade of the upper country.<sup>58</sup> And Indians still come to Montreal, but almost entirely to hold councils with the French, to receive presents or to get drunk. The real profits of the trade are being made by the officers in the western posts, by the company, by the large merchants, possibly even by lucky buyers somewhere in the wilderness of the Great Lakes. In other words, Montreal has emerged from the primitive economic conditions of savage life into the position of a distributing centre, a warehouse, to a certain degree a financial headquarters, an *entrepôt* in the modern sense of the term.

It might well have been imagined that such a development would have been accompanied by attempts to overcome some of the disadvantages of Montreal's position, or at least to improve its advantages. In fact, very little was done. From Quebec the St. Lawrence still provided the major means of communication: by water in summer, over the ice in winter; and in the summer if the winds were adverse it might take a whole month to do the journey up the river and back again to Quebec.<sup>59</sup> It was not until October, 1735 that a road was made all the way from Quebec to Montreal and the grand voyer, Lanoullier de Boisclère, wrote that he did the journey in four and a half days;<sup>60</sup> the road was, however, used only for passenger travel and the river remained the regular route for freighting goods. But under the French and indeed for years after the English had taken control, there was no harbour at Montreal, and no wharves; ships just ran alongside the shelving banks of the stream and goods were carried down planks to the shore or transferred into small boats—a method that was fraught with considerable inconvenience. The French, moreover, never appreciated the possibilities of the St. Lawrence; the vessels that came up to Montreal were small—they did not exceed eighty tons—and the appearance of the twenty-gun ship that Murray brought up the river when the English captured the city in 1760 struck the inhabitants with amazement.<sup>61</sup> It was this use of small ships that probably in part accounted for the heavy increase in the cost of goods between Quebec and Montreal. Moreover the difficulty of the St. Mary's current just below the city could not be tackled at all by the French, and it persisted all through the English régime and is a factor that has to be considered even today.

Above Montreal lay the Lachine Rapids and very early some sort of road was made from the city along the shore round the rapids so that goods could be carried up over land and then loaded into canoes at Lachine; but Dollier de Casson, the Superior of the Sulpician Seminary that was lord of the island, felt that more than this ought to be done. As early as 1680 he advanced a scheme to dig a canal for canoes round the rapids to Montreal, with a view not only of aiding navigation, but

<sup>58</sup>Franquet, *Voyages et mémoires sur le Canada*, 56.

<sup>59</sup>Letter from Dupuy of Oct. 20, 1727, printed in Innis, *Select Documents*, 396.

<sup>60</sup>*Ibid.*, 396-7.

<sup>61</sup>Johnstone, "Mémoires," printed in French in *Historical Documents of Quebec Literary and Historical Society*, series 9, 175, or in English in *Collection des manuscrits*, IV, 261; John Knox, *An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America* (Champlain Society), I, 358; II, 468, 473, 503.

also of providing power to turn mills for grinding corn, those already in existence being unable to meet the demand. This combination of navigation and power is an interesting foreshadowing of modern policy. By 1689 digging had actually been started, but Tronson, Dollier's superior in France, thought the scheme too expensive, money began to fail and the Iroquois wars intervened. In February, 1700 Tronson died; work could be once more resumed, and on October 30 Dollier entered into a contract with the engineer Gédéon de Catalogne to complete the canal so that it should be twelve feet broad and at least twelve inches deep even at low water in the St. Lawrence; the seminary was to provide all necessary tools and to pay 9000 livres "cours du pays"; in return de Catalogne undertook to finish the job by June, 1701. This he did not succeed in doing, an unexpected ridge of rock upsetting his plans, and Dollier's death in September, 1701 stopped the work, though water had actually commenced to run through and de Catalogne estimated that the canal needed to be dug only to the depth of three feet more for a distance of between 2,000 and 2,500 feet in order to enable canoes to pass. About 20,000 livres had already been spent; the Sulpicians were not wealthy and, though during the next thirty years several reports were made on the project, nothing was ever done, as the expense seemed prohibitive;<sup>62</sup> right down to the nineteenth century the Lachine Rapids remained a very serious barrier to the freighting of goods up the St. Lawrence.

What changes had Montreal itself undergone during the hundred years that followed its foundation? We have seen that the first settlement was established on a triangle of land between the river St. Pierre and the St. Lawrence. Very soon land was granted and cleared and casual wooden houses were erected across the St. Pierre and along the shore of the main stream, and gradually there emerged something like a short street, the rue St. Paul, parallel with the St. Lawrence and running down stream from the first market place, the present Place Royale; there from 1676 a market was ordered to be held twice a week,<sup>63</sup> though by 1749 Friday appears to have been the only market day.<sup>64</sup> The first twenty years of the town's existence saw, however, very little growth; in 1651 Père Ragueneau reported that only about fifty people remained in Montreal;<sup>65</sup> the Governor-General, M. d'Argenson, writing in November, 1659, spoke of Montreal as a "place that had made so much noise and which really amounted to so very little." Its fort where the boats landed at the mouth of the St. Pierre was already falling into ruins, though a redoubt and a mill were being built on a little hill to the east of the settlement. "There are about forty houses," he went on to say, "almost all in sight of one another, a good arrangement for they can thus in some measure defend one another: there are fifty heads of families and

<sup>62</sup>Report of Gédéon de Catalogne of Nov. 7, 1712, printed in Munro, *Documents relating to Seigniorial Tenure*, 100; Atherton, *History of Montreal*, I, 333-4; Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 32-3; J. N. Fauteux, *Essai sur l'industrie au Canada sous le régime français*, II, 333-4; O. Maurault, "Dollier de Casson" (*Revue trimestrielle canadienne*, Feb., 1919, 366-70); the contract with Catalogne is printed in the *Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1907, 88-90.

<sup>63</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, "Cadrans . . . horloges etc." (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, XXXV, June, 1929, 327-8); the two market days were definitely established by ordinance in 1706 (*Edits, Ordonnances Royaux*, 1855, II, 259).

<sup>64</sup>Peter Kalm, *Travels in North America*, trans. J. R. Forster (1770), III, 74.

<sup>65</sup>Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, XXXVI, 165.



in all about 160 men.”<sup>66</sup> And Asseline de Ronual, writing three years later, agreed that Montreal was sparsely populated and that there was nothing to be seen but a chapel in which two Jesuit fathers said Mass every day. “One’s life in that district,” he added, “is in greater danger than that of a bird on a branch.”<sup>67</sup>

The seventies and eighties saw the beginnings of rapidly growing prosperity for Montreal and the whole of New France. The vigorous efforts of Intendant Talon and of Colbert, the Minister in France, had brought out large numbers of new colonists, and in order to aid this emigration by making the country more attractive, they had done all they could to stimulate its economic development. In consequence, Montreal increased in size by leaps and bounds: by 1683 there were 140 families and well over 600 people; and there may have been as many as 900.<sup>68</sup> The Sulpicians were, of course, still lords of Montreal and there is a pleasant story of how their superior, Dollier de Casson, solemnly set out in the spring of 1672 accompanied by the surveyor and notary Basset to plot out the streets of Montreal, setting up stones with leaden stamps as boundary marks; thus was created the rue Notre Dame parallel to the rue St. Paul and a little further from the river bank, five cross streets were planned connecting the two, and a brief stretch of the rue St. Jacques was laid out a little to the north.<sup>69</sup> On this basis, a map giving a splendid picture of Montreal with its streets and close-set houses has been cheerfully assigned to this date; or it is possible that it was drawn solely from the imagination of some would-be historian; whatever its origin, it has been widely printed as representing Montreal in 1672.<sup>70</sup> But, though Dollier undoubtedly planned such streets, they were to receive no concrete realization for many years to come, and there has fortunately been recently discovered a map sent home by Denonville that was drawn not earlier than 1680 and probably as late as 1684; this shows clearly how meagre and scattered the houses of Montreal still were even at that date.<sup>71</sup> The expansion of the town was probably arrested by Iroquois wars at the end of the century, but in 1697 Sœur Morin can write that there were 200 good strong houses in Montreal,<sup>72</sup> and de la Potherie says that between 1701 and 1714 when he left the city, it had increased in size by fifty per cent.<sup>73</sup> There is a

<sup>66</sup>Letter of d'Argenson, Nov. 4, 1659, quoted in Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada*, II, 459-60.

<sup>67</sup>Journal of Asseline de Ronual (1662) printed in *Canadian Archives Report*, 1928, App. B, 31.

<sup>68</sup>*Mandements des Evêques de Québec*, I, 127-8; it says “647 âmes”—this may mean that only communicants were counted. When Dollier de Casson speaks of 1,400 or 1,500 people there in 1672, he means in the whole *district* of Montreal (Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 347). The recensement of 1666 had shown only 584 people in the district of Montreal, so Casson’s estimate is likely to be exaggerated (*Rapport de l’Archiviste de Québec*, 1935-6, 154).

<sup>69</sup>Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada*, III, 375-7; Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 31-2; E. Z. Massicotte, “La verbalisation des premières rues de Montreal” (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1932, 610-21).

<sup>70</sup>Faillon, I believe, was the first to print this map in his *Histoire de la colonie française en Canada*, III, 375.

<sup>71</sup>Catalogued in *Report of Public Archives of Canada*, 1932, 15, Ministère des Colonies D.F.C. no. 466. It shows the Sulpician Seminary and this was certainly not built before 1680; it also mentions the residence of Callières and he did not come to Montreal until 1684.

<sup>72</sup>Morin, *Annales de l’Hôtel-Dieu*, 26.

<sup>73</sup>La Potherie, *Histoire de l’Amérique septentrionale*, I, 339.

second map showing Montreal in 1729,<sup>74</sup> and here at last you can see a real city with Dollier de Casson's plan for the streets carried into effect. Rue Notre Dame now runs for as great a distance as does the older rue St. Paul and they are linked together by even more than the five cross streets which Dollier is supposed to have laid out.

Outside the walls, of which I shall speak presently, there appear very few houses to the east—or down stream; the so-called Quebec suburb is a later growth, but already there are a fair number to the west in the direction of Lachine; this was a sign partly of the early westward expansion of which I have spoken above, partly of the traffic that followed the road upstream in order to avoid the rapids, and partly of the greater amenities of the country in that direction.

In 1741 an enquiry by the Company of the Indies had shown that there were over 500 houses in Montreal;<sup>75</sup> in 1754 the population is estimated at 4000, including 60 wealthy merchants, 100 smaller merchants or master tradesmen, and 540 day labourers;<sup>76</sup> while at the beginning of the English occupation the map made by order of General Murray about 1760 records that there were 832 families in the city with 1,069 men capable of bearing arms.<sup>77</sup> This would give a population of about 5000 if due allowance is made for the high average size of the French-Canadian family. Even so Montreal can still be described by a contemporary writer as being "properly only two great long streets."<sup>78</sup> In a map of this period,<sup>79</sup> as compared with that of 1729, the houses appear to be packed closer together and suburbs are quite definitely growing up outside the gates. That on the Lachine road has increased in size and new ones have appeared to the north and east. This was not only the result of the natural increase in population—and it must be remembered that there was very little immigration into New France during the first half of the eighteenth century—but also of the increased feeling of security that followed upon the end of the Iroquois wars, or at any rate upon the pushing of such Indian wars as there were, well away from the walls of Montreal.

To what extent had defence been necessary against this Indian peril? The first savages that came to the infant settlement were undoubtedly friendly, and throughout its history it never had anything to fear from the Hurons or the Algonquins. But in regard to the Iroquois the situation was different. Friends of the Hurons or the Algonquins were enemies of the Iroquois and the French therefore from the beginning had incurred the steady hostility of the latter people. Moreover the Iroquois did not take very happily to missionary enterprise and French missionaries were active amongst them. Finally the Iroquois controlled

<sup>74</sup>Archives Nationales, Colonies.c.ii, A. Carton 126, no. 49, copy in Public Archives of Canada.

<sup>75</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, "Un recensement inédit" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1921, sect. I, 6).

<sup>76</sup>"A Capitation List of Canada, 1754" printed in O'Callaghan, *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, X, 271-5.

<sup>77</sup>*Canadian Archives*, Publication No. 8 (1912), 599-600.

<sup>78</sup>"Mémoires sur les affaires du Canada depuis 1749 jusqu'à 1760" (*Historical Documents of Quebec Literary and Historical Society*, series I, 203).

<sup>79</sup>"Plan of the Town and Fortifications of Montreal or Ville Marie in Canada" (engraved for the *Universal Magazine*, Nov., 1759). This is really a copy of a map made by T. Jefferys and dated Jan. 30, 1758 (see T. Jefferys, *Natural and Civil History of the French Dominions in North and South America*, I, opposite 12).



the route by which furs might travel down to the rivals of the French, the Dutch, and later the English, and this trade they were anxious to keep open, at the expense of Montreal and Quebec. For all these reasons Iroquois hostility to the French during the seventeenth century had been almost a foregone conclusion and that hostility was made all the more dangerous by the fact that the Iroquois destroyed and drove out the Algonquins and the Hurons, or forced them to join their tribes. But it is a great mistake to over-estimate the danger from the Indians, as the more romantic historians have done. They were not very good shots according to European standards; they were normally cowardly; they rarely faced a determined resistance, and, as soon as they had captured a few prisoners or a little loot, they were anxious to get home. Consequently, while they were undoubtedly a real danger to outlying farms and very small settlements, they rarely undertook anything approaching a siege or made an attack upon a group of well-defended houses, unless successful surprise or overwhelming numbers gave them confidence. The famous expedition of Dollard des Ormeaux did not save Montreal, for the Indians who defeated him had no intention of attacking it.<sup>80</sup>

At first, as we have seen, the colonists lived upon a triangular piece of land between the St. Pierre River and the St. Lawrence and some sort of stockaded fort was erected there to which they could retire in an emergency. By 1660 this had fallen into ruins and though a small redoubt had been built on a little hill down stream, the houses that had spread along the shore relied mainly upon mutual support for their safety. For a prosperous and growing settlement this was felt to be a dangerous state of affairs and therefore in 1687 the Governor of the city, Callières, surrounded Montreal with a stockade of cedar posts five to six feet high,<sup>81</sup> the King paying for the labour and the inhabitants providing the wood. If this had been kept in good condition, there would have been little to fear from the Indians except for those inhabitants who ventured afield or lived on outlying farms. Indeed in the most devastating raid the Indians ever made on the island, the Lachine massacre of 1689, when just over 100 inhabitants perished, there was no attempt made to attack Montreal.<sup>82</sup> But the stockade was not kept in good repair: the royal engineer, Chaussegros de Léry, reported in August, 1717, that Montreal "is surrounded only by a poor enclosure of stakes, part of which are rotten. The inhabitants have made in it several openings and there is no gate in a state to be shut. It is not closed during the whole year . . . what remains of the enclosure of stakes will last at most from four to five years."<sup>83</sup> De Léry was really thinking not so much of defence against the Indians as against the English from the Hudson valley. Already in May, 1716 the Conseil de la Marine had recommended the building of a stone wall, and in 1717 de Léry sent over full plans for royal approval. He says that he started building in the same year and

<sup>80</sup>E. R. Adair, "Dollard des Ormeaux and the Fight at the Long Sault" (*Canadian Historical Review*, June, 1932, 121-38); G. Lanctot, "Was Dollard the Saviour of New France?" (*ibid.*, 138-46); see also *Canadian Historical Review*, Sept., 1932, 336-41.

<sup>81</sup>Morin, *Annales de l'Hôtel-Dieu*, 25-6; *Nouvelle France: Documents historiques*, 117; Dollier de Casson, *History of Montreal*, 42.

<sup>82</sup>Girouard, *Lake St. Louis*, 135; Margry, *Mémoires et documents*, VI, 112-13.

<sup>83</sup>*Nouvelle France: Documents historiques*, 117; A. Sandham, *Montreal and its Fortifications*, 12-18.

the wall was certainly well under way by the summer of 1721, the cost being met by an annual levy from the citizens of Montreal and from the Seminary; it was completed by 1741 and, though the King made a large grant in 1743 in order to help meet the expense, the inhabitants were still paying for it in 1751.<sup>84</sup> The wall was well planned as can be seen from the maps. The town was roughly a long rectangle and on one of its longest sides—that on the south—the wall followed the St. Lawrence and the river St. Pierre. Within the city the ground rose fairly steadily from the edge of the river up to the rue Notre Dame. There it formed a long level-topped ridge, dropping again steeply to the little river St. Martin, which ran along almost the whole length of the town on its northern side,<sup>85</sup> and it was along the edge of this steep declivity that the land wall was built, thus raising it well above the adjacent country. The line that it followed is still known as Fortification Lane. The two end walls were short and through them were pierced two of the most used gates of the town, the Port St. Martin or Quebec Gate, through which ran the road down stream, and the Recollets Gate leading to the west.

When the wall was built the citizens were very proud of it with its eight gates and its dry ditch seven feet deep, but professional soldiers found it hopelessly inadequate for defence against regular troops, and in 1759-60 the Chevalier de Johnstone describes it as hardly better than a garden wall; Knox refers to it as "a slight wall of masonry, solely calculated to awe the numerous tribes of Indians"; it was evident to him that it was "never designed but as a security against arrows or small arms." The fort on Windmill Hill in the eastern part of Montreal was no better: Franquet in 1752 reported that all it was good for was to fire salutes at times of public rejoicing, and Knox said that its sole defence was "six or eight old worm-eaten guns, some of which are not mounted." This utter weakness in matters of defence made Vaudreuil's decision in 1760 to concentrate the French troops in Montreal an act of folly, and Amherst had only to threaten a bombardment to bring about the city's immediate fall.<sup>86</sup> The wall was finally destroyed in the early years of the nineteenth century,<sup>87</sup> and the redoubt on Windmill Hill gave place to Place Viger Station. But Montreal did not rely for defence upon its walls alone: it had had a small regular garrison since 1665, soldiers had been settled in the Richelieu valley to serve as a barrier against attacks from the south, an outlying fort had been built at Chambly and the Indians of the missions proved invaluable as raiders and spies. Indeed, in 1721 Charlevoix said clearly: "What has been the preservation of Montreal . . . during the last wars, are the two villages of Iroquois

<sup>84</sup>*Archives de Québec, Ordonnances des Intendants*, III, 153; *Edits, Ordonnances Royaux*, I, 567-8; *Nouvelle France: Documents historiques*, 117, 159-60, 179. The citizens were to pay 4000 livres per annum, and the Seminary 2000.

<sup>85</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, "Le Champ de Mars de Montréal au xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle" (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, XXXVI, Jan., 1930, 7).

<sup>86</sup>Gosselin, *L'Eglise du Canada*, II, 345-6, quoting letters of 1738; *Historical Documents of Quebec Literary and Historical Society*, series 9, 175-6; "Mémoires sur les affaires du Canada depuis 1749 jusqu'à 1760" (*ibid.*, series 1, 203). See also Knox, *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America*, II, 604-5; Kalm, *Travels into North America*, III, 72-3; E. Z. Massicotte, "Quelques rues et faubourgs de vieux Montréal" (*Cahiers de Dix*, no. I, 108-9).

<sup>87</sup>Sandham, *Montreal and its Fortifications*, 21-3.



Christians and the fort of Chambly."<sup>88</sup> The two villages were the Sulpician mission on the mountain just outside the walls of Montreal<sup>89</sup> and the Jesuit mission of Caughnawaga on the opposite side of the river.

The Indians may have proved a blessing in so far as they aided Montreal's defence, but in every other direction they were an unmitigated curse. Apparently nothing could stop their drinking or control their violence in Montreal once they had become drunk, and this applies quite as much to the so-called Christian Indians, as to their heathen cousins. The government issued regulations, the Bishop of Quebec fulminated against those who sold the savages strong liquor; the Sulpicians complained bitterly that the peace within their Seminary was disturbed by ribald and drunken howling—all was in vain. On June 12, 1683 the Christian Indians from the two missions are reported to have been drinking in Montreal for ten or twelve days past; they have committed "extraordinary disorders" and the Intendant commands that any Indians caught drunk in the town who make "the slightest indecent or unruly action" shall be at once cast into prison and the French who sold them drink be fined 10 livres on the spot.<sup>90</sup> But the situation did not improve. In 1684 Montreal is described by the Intendant as "more like a hell than an orderly town," and French as well as Indians are forbidden "to get drunk with tumult and uproar."<sup>91</sup> The Abbé Belmont in 1700 calls Montreal "a little Babylon which has overwhelmed and intoxicated all the nations with the wine of its prostitution," and in drunkenness he sees the cause of God's fury against the faithful in sending wars and pestilence, famine and storms.<sup>92</sup> This was certainly in a sermon, where oratorical licence is allowable, but an anonymous writer at the beginning of the eighteenth century shows that this clerical denunciation was hardly too strong: "When they feel their heads beginning to turn, they rejoice and commence to sing their death-chant, into which they put all the imprecations against their enemies; then feeling themselves drunk, they throw away their clothes or just let them drop and often fight one another naked in the very town; they gnaw one another's noses and ears with their teeth; you see few of them who have their faces intact. You see them howling and running with their knives in their hands and they are filled with glee to see women and children flee before them, just as if they were masters of the world."<sup>93</sup> And Charlevoix in 1721 tells much the same story. "In the streets of Montreal are seen," he writes, "the most shocking spectacles . . . husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, children, brothers and sisters seizing of one another by the throats, tearing of one another by the ears, and worrying one another with their teeth like so many enraged wolves. The air resounded during the night with their cries and howlings much more horrible than those with which wild beasts affright the woods."<sup>94</sup> Even in 1757 Montcalm

<sup>88</sup>Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, 141.

<sup>89</sup>The mission on the mountain had been founded in 1676; it was decided to move the Indians out to Sault-au-Récollet in 1696 and from there in 1721 they were finally settled near Oka on the Lake of the Two Mountains.

<sup>90</sup>*Archives de Québec, Ordonnances des Gouverneurs et Intendants*, 1639-1706, II, 39.

<sup>91</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 77-8.

<sup>92</sup>Faillon, *Vie de Mlle. Mance*, II, 173-8.

<sup>93</sup>"Histoire de l'eau de vie en Canada" printed in "Collection de mémoires et de relations sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada" (*Historical Documents of Quebec Literary and Historical Society*, series 1, 12-14).

<sup>94</sup>Charlevoix, *Journal of a Voyage to North America*, ed. L. P. Kellogg (1923), I, 204-6.

viewing the Indians in Montreal can write "Paradise for them is to get drunk."<sup>95</sup>

This was one of the scourges of Montreal, the other was the danger of fire, for the houses were very largely built of wood. Of course there were stone houses. A fine stone church had been built between 1672 and 1685; this was pulled down in 1830 and the present neo-gothic monstrosity erected in its place.<sup>96</sup> Madame Bourgeois saw her chapel of Bonsecours being built between 1675 and 1678, and a few years later the Jesuits (1692-1721) and the Récollets (1693-1700) each erected a church and a residence.<sup>97</sup> Between 1685 and 1712 the Sulpicians built themselves what La Hontan calls their "beautiful, great and stately house, built of squared stone",<sup>98</sup> fortunately all but one wing of this still stands, as does also the stone house built in 1705 by de Ramezay, Governor of Montreal; this later was to house first the French Company of the Indies and then the English governors. Vaudreuil built his fine mansion close at hand between 1723 and 1726.<sup>99</sup> A little farther west lay the Hôtel-Dieu and the large house of the Sisters of the Congregation, while on the Pointe-à-Callières where Maisonneuve had first landed were the Hôpital-Général and the Château which Callières built during his governorship of Montreal.<sup>100</sup>

After the disastrous fire of 1721 the Intendant Bégon issued an ordinance forbidding in future any houses to be built of wood, though three weeks later he allowed rebuilding to be carried out in wood by certain specified inhabitants on condition that such houses were pulled down again within three years.<sup>101</sup> Later ordinances tried to insist on stone houses; quarries of good stone and lime for making mortar were to be found close at hand.<sup>102</sup> Yet all was in vain; M. de Monrepos was still forbidding the building of wooden houses in 1755, and Kalm who visited the city in 1749 reported that most of its houses were built of wood, though Murray in 1760 said that stone was replacing wood, except in the suburbs.<sup>103</sup> The tale of fires, not only during the French régime, but under that of the English that followed, is appalling. In 1683 the house of the Sisters of the Congregation was burnt, and, as Bishop St. Vallier writes, "they saved neither their furniture nor their wardrobes, being only too happy to have saved themselves, even then two of their number perished in its flames",<sup>104</sup> in 1694 the whole Indian mission on

<sup>95</sup>Montcalm, *Journal des campagnes*, 299, Aug. 29, 1757 (*Collection de Lévis* ed. H. R. Casgrain).

<sup>96</sup>*Annuaire de la Ville-Marie*, 346-8; O. Maurault, *Le Vieux Séminaire*, 8.

<sup>97</sup>O. Lapalice, "Les pierres angulaires . . . de Bonsecours" (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1930, 449-505, 519); *Annuaire de la Ville-Marie*, 131.

<sup>98</sup>La Hontan, *Nouveaux Voyages . . . dans l'Amérique septentrionale* (1703), 27.

<sup>99</sup>*Société historique de Montréal*, XI, 1917, 28-30; V. Morin, "Les Ramezay et leur Château" (*Cahiers de Dix*, no. 3, pp. 12-13, 30, 43-5); E. Z. Massicotte, "Ce que fut la place Jacques Cartier à Montréal" (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1935, 228-32).

<sup>100</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, "Le Château de Callière à Montréal" (*Bulletin des Recherches historiques*, 1939, 309-13).

<sup>101</sup>*Édits, Ordonnances Royaux*, II, 292-4; *Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Intendants*, I, 205-6.

<sup>102</sup>Report of Gédéon de Catalogne, Nov. 7, 1712, printed in Munro, *Documents relating to Seigniorial Tenure*, 98; Kalm, *Travels into North America*, III, 285-6; Fauteux, *Essai sur l'industrie au Canada sous le régime français*, I, 131-3.

<sup>103</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, *Répertoire des arrêts, édits . . . de Montréal*, 130-1; *Canadian Archives, Publications No. 8*, 599-600; Kalm, *Travels*, III, 73.

<sup>104</sup>St. Vallier, *Estat present de l'Eglise* (1688), 64-5 (reprinted, Quebec, 1856), also printed in H. Têtu and C. O. Gagnon, *Mandements . . . des Evêques de Québec*, I, 207-11.



the mountain was destroyed; in the following year the Hôtel-Dieu was burnt to the ground; it was rebuilt only to be burnt again in 1721 and again in 1734.<sup>105</sup> The fire of June 19, 1721 was started by a soldier enthusiastically firing off his musket in church during the procession of the Blessed Sacrament, and 138 houses, nearly half of Montreal, were burnt down before the fire was stopped by pulling off the blazing roofs with hooks;<sup>106</sup> the loss was estimated at over 1,000,000 livres. That of 1734 was started by a negro slave-woman, and 46 houses were destroyed.<sup>107</sup> The church of Bonsecours was burnt in 1754 and with it most of that quarter of the town.<sup>108</sup> The great fire of 1765 destroyed 108 houses in the wealthiest part of the city; that of 1768 burnt over 100 more, while, as Bishop Briand put it, "the earth was still smoking from the fire" of three years before.<sup>109</sup>

These successive fires devastated Montreal right down to the nineteenth century and swept away a great deal that was of aesthetic and historic interest. Is it surprising, then, that in view of these repeated and sweeping disasters, Montreal under the French, notwithstanding its economic importance, never really emerged very far from the conditions of a frontier town? The old church of Notre Dame was a fine building, the Seminary was sedate and dignified; Charlevoix called it "solid and commodious" rather than "magnificent";<sup>110</sup> and there were several other religious establishments of some size; there were also a few fine substantial houses, but the rest were probably small and possessed no great beauty. In 1706 the streets can still be described as "almost impracticable at all seasons of the year not only for foot passengers but even for carriages and carts, on account of the mud which is to be found in them which comes as much from the softness and unevenness of the ground as from the filth that the inhabitants throw there daily"; and in the same year "all inhabitants of whatsoever quality and condition they may be" are forbidden to keep pigs in their houses.<sup>111</sup> Moreover, again and again right down to 1761 were the citizens forbidden to let their pigs wander at will in the streets.<sup>112</sup>

Still, it would be unfair to exaggerate the primitive character of Montreal at the end of the French régime. It had an established social life, which burst into an activity rivalling that of Quebec when the Governor-General and the Intendant arrived in Montreal, as they

<sup>105</sup>"Histoire de l'eau de vie en Canada," (*Historical Documents* of Quebec Literary and Historical Society, series 1, 12-14); *Annuaire de la Ville-Marie*, 60-1, 149; *Mandements . . . des Evêques de Québec*, I, 500-1.

<sup>106</sup>Gosselin, *L'Eglise du Canada*, I, 398; Vaudreuil and Bégon to Conseil de la Marine, Jan. 19, 1722, and M. de Ramezay to Conseil de la Marine, Oct. 4, 1721, both printed in *Nouvelle France: Documents historiques*, 187, 190-1.

<sup>107</sup>*Annuaire de la Ville-Marie*, 61; Gosselin, *L'Eglise du Canada*, II, 274; Lapalice, "Les esclaves noirs à Montréal sous l'ancien régime" (*Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal*, July, 1915, series 3, XII, 145-7).

<sup>108</sup>E. Z. Massicotte, *Faits curieux de l'histoire de Montréal*, 31, quoting Leleu, *Histoire de Notre-Dame de Bon-Secours*.

<sup>109</sup>Atherton, *History of Montreal*, II, 397-401; *Mandements . . . des Evêques de Québec*, II, 210-11.

<sup>110</sup>Charlevoix, *Journal d'un voyage . . . dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, 138.

<sup>111</sup>Ordonnance de Raudot, June 22, 1706, printed in Innis, *Select Documents*, 310; *Edits, Ordonnances Royaux*, II, 258-62.

<sup>112</sup>E.g., *Archives de Québec: Ordonnances des Gouverneurs et Intendants, 1639-1706*, II, 308-9, Aug. 9, 1702; *Edits, Ordonnances Royaux*, II, 276, June 29, 1710; E. Z. Massicotte, *Répertoire des arrêts, édits . . . de Montréal*, 130, 136, 137, May 24, 1755, Oct. 9, 1757, April 25, 1758; *Canadian Archives Report*, 1918, App. B, 45, April 29, 1761.

usually did, early in the year to make arrangements for the supplies to be sent to the western posts and the presents to be made to the Indians.<sup>113</sup> For three or four months Montreal became the social capital of New France. When to this was added any considerable body of regular troops, entertainments became almost oppressive, and Montcalm, for instance, complained bitterly of the round of dinners and suppers and balls; the Chevalier de Lévis "had invited 65 ladies young and old; thirty would have been enough, so many men being away at war. The hall was brilliantly illuminated . . . much ceremony and attentive hospitality, refreshments in abundance all the night, and of every kind and species and the party did not leave till 7 o'clock in the morning." Montcalm, however, went to bed at an early hour.<sup>114</sup> In the spring of 1757 Lévis had "given three beautiful great balls for Montcalm before Lent. In addition to the dinners, and the big suppers for ladies three times a week."<sup>115</sup> But the citizens loved good cheer and hospitality; in 1760 Knox found them "gay and sprightly, much more attached to dress and finery than those of Quebec"; in fact the women had a passion for adornment and were said to sacrifice everything in order to satisfy it; the men complained that they were "taking too much care of their dress and squandering all their fortunes and more upon it." Montcalm found Canadian women "witty, courteous and pious, at Quebec gamesters, at Montreal more devoted to conversation and the dance." There was in fact considerable rivalry between the ladies of Quebec and Montreal, and apparently a cause of great grief to the latter was the shortage of men, for all the best ones that came out from France were snapped up by the maidens of Quebec before they had a chance to come up the river and inspect the beauties of Montreal. Though Kalm in 1749 could write of the "more becoming modesty at Montreal," the pressure of this competition apparently drove the young ladies of that city to very direct methods, for he adds, "One of the first questions they propose to a stranger is, whether he is married? The next, how he likes the ladies in the country? . . . And the third, whether he will take one home with him?"<sup>116</sup>

I have tried to paint a picture of the material and social development of Montreal during the French régime, to show how it started in the middle of the seventeenth century as a scattered village devoted first to missionary and then to fur-trading enterprise. How from this, by the end of the French period, it had developed into a modest little town with its bursts of gaiety and social activity during the winter and the early spring; the missionary enterprise had nearly vanished, but the fur-trading had grown to a great organized business, reaching three-quarters of the way across the continent, threatening the English expansion eastwards, and bringing to Montreal a great deal of such prosperity as it possessed. Montreal might be the seat of a royal governor, the centre of a governmental district, the market to which habitants

<sup>113</sup>Franquet, *Voyages et mémoires sur le Canada*, 129, 141.

<sup>114</sup>Montcalm to Bourlamaque, quoted by Atherton, *History of Montreal*, I, 400-1.

<sup>115</sup>*Canadian Archives Report*, 1929, App. A, 55, Montcalm to his wife, April 16, 1757.

<sup>116</sup>"Mémoires sur les affaires du Canada depuis 1749 jusqu'à 1760," (*Historical Documents of Quebec Literary and Historical Society*, series 1, 203); Knox, *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America*, II, 605; Kalm, *Travels into North America*, III, 281-4; *Canadian Archives Report*, 1929, App. A, 56, Montcalm to his wife, April 16, 1757.



from the whole countryside brought their surplus goods and where they purchased the few manufactured articles they needed; but these are really small things, for it was from French Montreal that the foundations were laid for that great fur empire that was to be established by the Hudson Bay men and the North-westerners, and that stretched from the Arctic to the Pacific, from the Mackenzie to the Mississippi.

#### DISCUSSION

*Mr. Lower* said: J'ai écouté avec beaucoup de plaisir aux articles qui sont présentés ce matin. C'est bien convenable que notre première séance commence par l'étude de la grande ville métropole dont on célèbre actuellement le tercentenaire. L'étude du développement de Montréal a, il me semble, l'importance particulière. Je crois qu'une des clefs la plus signifiante à notre histoire est le concept des villes métropoles avec leurs régions tributaires, qu'on appelle en notre histoire le *pays d'en haut* ou dans un sens plus général le *hinterland*. Le *hinterland* est tout le pays où l'influence de la ville métropole domine le pays duquel les produits soutiennent et favorisent le progrès du centre métropole. Le centre peut être une ville de commerce comme Montréal et New York; il peut être une grande ville politique comme Londres—le meilleur exemple de métropole dans le monde—il peut être même une grande capitale religieuse. Aussi Rome est une centre métropole en sens religieux comme Londres l'est en sens politique et commercial.

En Canada il est certain que Montréal a été notre centre métropole pendant toute notre histoire, dominant le Canada jusqu'au Pacifique. Mais, aujourd'hui il y a des influences qui disputent avec Montréal sa place. Néanmoins, pour l'historien, Montréal est la ville la plus signifiante en Canada, même la plus intéressante. C'est pour ces raisons et pour les bons essais que nous venons d'écouter que je remercie et félicite les messieurs qui les ont lus.

## L'ATTEIRISSAGE DE JACQUES CARTIER DANS L'ÎLE DE MONTRÉAL

(RÉSUMÉ DE LA COMMUNICATION PRÉSENTÉE  
PAR M. GUSTAVE LANCTOT)

TOUTE nouvelle interprétation d'un fait historique témoigne de la vitalité de l'histoire. Mais, avant d'obtenir son droit de cité, il lui faut subir la double épreuve de la démonstration et de la critique.

En 1922, deux membres de la Société historique de Montréal avancèrent, pour la première fois, la théorie que Jacques Cartier aborda dans l'île de Montréal par la rivière des Prairies et non par le fleuve Saint-Laurent, comme tout le monde l'avait toujours cru depuis 1535. Cette thèse nordiste repose uniquement, en fin de compte, sur deux affirmations qu'elle prétend tirer des relations de Jacques Cartier.

La première déclare que, dans sa montée du Saint-Laurent, le but réel du navigateur était la recherche d'un passage qui, par le nord-ouest, le mènerait au pays des épices, d'où il résulte que, dans sa navigation, il négligera la côte sud pour s'attacher à l'exploration de la côte nord dans l'espoir d'y découvrir une rivière s'ouvrant à l'ouest.

Mais les textes contredisent carrément cette affirmation. Le grand objectif de Cartier, selon ses propres paroles, c'est "le *parachèvement* de la découverte des terres occidentales," ce qui veut dire de la découverte du merveilleux royaume du Saguenay, où se trouve "grande quantité d'or et de cuivre." Il ajoute que "le droict et bon chemin dudict Saguenay, et plus seur, est par le dict fleuve jusques au dessus de Hochelaga."

La preuve que le Malouin a pour but, non de découvrir le passage du Nord-Ouest, mais la route du Saguenay en suivant le fleuve jusqu'à Hochelaga, se trouve en dix endroits de ses relations. Il suffira de rappeler que, le 19 septembre, il met à la voile, selon ses propres expressions, pour "aller à Hochelaga" en naviguant "amont le dict fleuve" Saint-Laurent.

Ainsi la première affirmation sur laquelle se base la thèse nordiste que Cartier cherchait le passage du Nord-Ouest et qu'il entra par suite dans la rivière des Prairies, qui court à l'ouest, au lieu de continuer dans le fleuve, qui se dirige vers le sud, cette affirmation se trouve contreprouvée par les déclarations mêmes de l'explorateur et les faits actuels de son voyage.

La deuxième affirmation de la thèse nordiste, basée sur une interprétation des récits de Cartier, peut se résumer comme suit. Le premier saut rencontré par le Malouin ne peut être le courant Sainte Marie, parce que la narration déclare qu'on ne put le franchir, alors que ce courant a toujours pu se remonter. Ensuite, sur le fleuve qu'il a navigué, Cartier a rencontré trois sauts sur une distance de six lieues environ. De plus, il doit se trouver entre le deuxième et le troisième saut, le tiers de la distance qui existe entre le premier et le deuxième. Or, ces faits topographiques ne se rencontrent pas dans le fleuve en face de Montréal. D'autre part, dans la rivière des Prairies, existent trois sauts compris dans une distance de cinq à six lieues, et la distance entre le deuxième et le troisième est exactement le tiers de la distance entre le premier et le second. Donc, la rivière des Prairies est bien la route suivie par Cartier.



Malheureusement les relations de Cartier ne corroborent pas ces affirmations. D'abord, la relation de Cartier non seulement ne dit pas que l'on ne put franchir le premier saut, mais elle ne fait même aucune mention d'un *premier* saut.

Ensuite, le texte ne dit pas que les trois sauts s'échelonnaient sur une distance de six lieues, mais déclare simplement que d'après les Indiens, "il ne peut y avoir que six lieues *par terre* pour passer les dits sauts." Evidemment, cela signifie six lieues de portage et non pas une distance totale de six lieues entre le premier et le dernier saut.

Enfin, le récit des voyages ne dit pas qu'il y avait, entre le deuxième et le troisième saut, le tiers de la distance qui se trouvait entre les deux premiers. La narration porte simplement ceci que le troisième saut "n'étoit qu'à une tierce partie du chemin plus oultre que nous avions parcouru." Or, le chemin parcouru n'est pas la distance entre le premier et le troisième saut, puisque cette distance Cartier ne l'a pas parcourue, étant arrêté, selon les nordistes, par le premier saut. Mais le *chemin parcouru*, c'est la distance entre le point de départ, qui est Stadaconé, et le point d'arrêt, qui semble bien être le saut Saint-Louis, que Cartier déclare infranchissable. Or, il est de fait que le troisième saut des Indiens, qui est le Long Saut, se trouve approximativement "à une tierce partie" du chemin entre Stadaconé et le saut Saint-Louis. Ainsi, c'est bien le Saint-Laurent, que Cartier a remonté dans sa navigation.

A titre d'argument supplémentaire, ajoutons que les cartes contemporaines, basées sur les dessins de Cartier, indiquent que Hochelaga se trouvait sur la rive nord du fleuve navigué par Cartier, ce qui dénote que ce fleuve est le Saint-Laurent. Car si Cartier avait abordé l'île par le nord, c'est-à-dire par la rivière des Prairies, Hochelaga se trouverait sur la rive sud.

La thèse nordiste s'avère, enfin, insoutenable devant le résultat, admis par ses partisans, que, si Cartier est venu par la rivière des Prairies, Hochelaga ne pouvait pas être où il se trouvait: il faut déplacer le site de la bourgade, site établi par les textes de Cartier et de Champlain et par les fouilles des ethnologues et des archéologues. Conclusion: c'est donc bel et bien le Saint-Laurent que Cartier a suivi pour atteindre Hochelaga dans l'île de Montréal en 1535.

# ECONOMIC NATIONALISM AND CONFEDERATION

By D. G. CREIGHTON  
*The University of Toronto*

## I

It should be emphasized at once that in this paper I make no attempt to supply what might be called an "economic interpretation" of Confederation. The effort to explain one group of phenomena supposedly "political" in character by reference to another group of phenomena supposedly "economic" in character seems to me as mechanical and unreal as the historical dichotomy upon which it is based. I am interested, not in seeking such simple causal connections, but in exploring some small part of the enormously complicated relationships of industrialism and nationality in the nineteenth century. In the British Empire, Germany, and the United States, the rise of the new industry and the new transport was accompanied by a strong tendency towards territorial expansion and by an equally marked impulse towards political union and centralization. It seems to me that the foundation and early growth of the Dominion of Canada afford a small but fairly typical example of this complex politic-economic process. Within the short space of less than fifteen years, the British North American provinces reached four major decisions: they decided upon political union, westward expansion, transcontinental railways, and a protective tariff. The coincidence of these decisions was surely not accidental: they were all products of a vast complex system of related forces which were continually acting and reacting upon each other. It is this process of interaction that I propose to explore—in a very general fashion—this afternoon. And I shall focus attention upon only one of these four decisions—the determination to establish a protective tariff—in an endeavour to trace its origins and estimate its significance in the general historical process.

In the middle 1840's, the point at which this analysis must begin, the great triumphs of industrialism and nationality were still in the future. Except in England, the broad general interests of agriculture and commerce still dominated affairs. The economic order was characterized by wooden shipping, wind- and water-power, ocean and river transport. The relatively tranquil world of politics was made up of little states, small provinces, unconsolidated federations and sprawling, decentralized empires. The provinces of British North America had grown up in this world and they were fairly happily adjusted to it. Their economies were based upon the St. Lawrence River and the Atlantic Ocean; agriculture, lumbering, and fishing were their staple industries; and they had put their money into canals to improve the inland waterways and into wooden ships to peddle their goods around the world. It was their settled habit to think in terms of remote markets, of commercial systems which extended far beyond their narrow boundaries and vastly transcended their parochial interests. They were members—and fairly satisfied members—of the low-tariff British mercantile system; and the idea of reciprocity, of interchange of privileges, of economic and political give-and-take, was familiar and acceptable to them. Their trade relations with each other were almost negligible; they had no political link beside their common allegiance to Great Britain; and nobody had yet conceived the idea of a transcontinental British North American



union. There was little interest in the remote West, little conception of the future of railways, and little appreciation of the vast potentialities of the tariff.

This innocent and idyllic world of our great grandfathers must have appeared to possess a most comforting substantiality. But in actual fact it was already ominously threatened with approaching dissolution. The first major shock which fell upon it came, appropriately enough, from the original industrialist country, Great Britain. In Great Britain, as in Germany, the United States, and British North America, the problem of commercial policy in general and of the tariff in particular was of essential importance in this period of rapid economic and political change. There were few measures which summed up the interests and expressed the philosophy of the new industrialism and the new nationality more completely and effectively than the repeal of the Corn Laws. To John Bright and the other reforming manufacturers, who somehow contrived to suggest that they ran their mills as unimportant side-shows to the main business of professional moralizing, the principle of free trade was a timeless truth of universal validity. It was not only economic orthodoxy: it was certainly Christian morality: there were even inspired moments when it seemed to take on the awful grandeur of divine revelation. In the light of these heavenly intimations it was easy for the free traders to convince themselves—and very nearly to convince posterity—that they acted in a spirit of cosmic altruism. Obsessed with the elevation of humanity in general, they drove straight towards the goal of national self-interest. In the main, the Anti-Corn Law League was an association of British manufacturers who preferred, with natural Christian humility, to conceal their real identity; and the repeal of the Corn Laws was just as strictly and exclusively a policy of economic nationalism as the tallest tariff on earth. In the interest of industrial specialization at home, and world trade abroad, the free traders had sacrificed both the agriculture of Great Britain and the commerce of British North America. "Blessed are the free in trade," ran the new British industrial beatitude, "for they shall inherit the earth." This terrestrial paradise of world commerce glimmered radiantly in the distance; but to win it, to make oneself worthy of it, it was first necessary to cast off the fleshly trammels of the old British Empire. For Great Britain the new nationality was at first inevitably written as "Little Englandism." It meant the withdrawal of colonial preferences, the recall of colonial troops, the abandonment of colonial obligations. Just as Prussia was forced to break up the ramshackle Germanic Confederation before she could achieve the consolidated German Empire, so Great Britain had to shake herself free from the Old Colonial System before she could begin to realize the world empire of free trade.

This sudden assertion of British national independence was the first formidable impact of the new order on British North America. It was followed almost immediately by another shock, the direct introduction of the new technology. The repeal of the Corn Laws compelled the provinces to grope their way towards a new commercial policy: the construction of the first railways equipped them with the rudiments of the new industrial system. In Great Britain, the first rapid growth of machine manufacture had preceded the construction of railways; but in North America—and for obvious reasons—this order was almost exactly reversed. In the new continent the railway was the first great

embodiment of the age of iron and steam; and the construction of the Grand Trunk and the other railways of the 1850's formed the first stage of the slow industrialization of British North America. From that time onward, the development of the provinces was guided by the compulsion of two forces, one external and one native to the provinces themselves. The external pressure was to come from those two great industrialized nationalities, Great Britain and the United States: the internal pressure was to originate in the movement towards industrialism and nationality within British North America. Each of these influences was driving the provinces towards a new policy, political and commercial. And in time it was to be discovered that the goal of both was one and the same.

## II

There was, however, nothing very novel in the first British North American reaction to the new world order. The original responses ran along safely traditional lines. Flung rudely out of the shelter of the Old Colonial System, the provinces could not believe themselves capable of enduring what the British industrial monopolists could complacently refer to as the "bracing atmosphere" of free trade; and except for a moment, during the deep depression of 1849, there was not much serious discussion of a protective tariff. In fact, the provinces had not the slightest intention of taking any action which, in the elephantine language of modern diplomacy, could be described as unilateral. Through long membership in the British Empire, they were accustomed to the idea of an interchange of privileges, of a rough balance of benefits and concessions. And when Great Britain had summarily and forcibly ejected them from their first commercial association, they turned naturally to that other imperialist power, the United States. In 1854, they concluded with the American Republic a treaty of Reciprocity, which established a series of reciprocal preferences and concessions, more systematic certainly than anything the provinces had known before, but roughly on the same lines as the old imperial system.

Within the comforting protection of these new fiscal arrangements, the provinces intended to carry on pretty much as they had done before. They were still largely absorbed in commerce, not manufacturing. They still thought, not in terms of a British North American economy, but in terms of great international commercial systems based on the ocean and the continental rivers. Even though they now began to use the new technology of steam and iron, they used it instinctively to buttress and strengthen commercial empires which had been built up long before in the pre-industrial age. It was significant that the Intercolonial, the one serious railway project which was intended to link the Maritimes with the Province of Canada, was taken up by governments rather than by private capitalists; and it was significant also that all the governments concerned, at one time or another, extricated themselves from agreements for its construction with the most surprising agility. The Grand Trunk, which was by far the biggest British American railway enterprise of the period, was obviously planned to strengthen the old international trading system of the St. Lawrence. It was intended, like the St. Lawrence canals before it, to capture the trade of the American Middle West.

All this implied—or seemed to imply—merely a slight modification of the old objectives and methods. The revised arrangement looked



durable: but there were elements of disturbance within it. And of these variables perhaps the most important was the ominously uncertain condition of the United States. The Reciprocity Treaty—and it is essential to remember this—was negotiated *before* the triumph of industrialism and coercive centralized nationality in the United States. It was a typical product of the period when the agrarianism and commercialism of the South still struggled against the encroaching industrialism of the North. The South had taught the continent its ideas of equalitarian democracy, preached the principle of local autonomy for the benefit of little states and provinces, struggled to defend a rough balance of agricultural, commercial, and industrial interests within the republic. The Reciprocity Treaty was in part injurious to southern interests; but the South supported it precisely because it believed that the arrangement would satisfy the British provinces and prevent or delay their annexation to the United States. The passage of the Reciprocity Treaty was, in fact, one of the last efforts of the South to preserve the economic and political balance of power on the continent, to save North America from what Parrington has called “an unquestioning and uncritical consolidation.” It was one of the South’s last successes. For the Treaty was accepted in the year that witnessed the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which in effect destroyed the Missouri Compromise. From that moment the struggle between North and South for the control of the western domain approached its final paroxysm. And the new Republican party, which represented big business, coercive centralization, and truculent imperialism, adopted a protectionist creed which was to make such arrangements as the Reciprocity Treaty an idle dream for the next half-century.

But the approaching crisis, which was to transform the United States into an industrial and centralized nation, had not yet actually arrived. In the meantime, while North and South were slowly marshalling their forces for the conflict, the first results of railway building began to show themselves in British North America. One at least of these consequences might have been anticipated with tolerable certainty. From the earliest times, the governments of North America including those of the northern British provinces, had been compelled to make one peculiar and significant modification in the doctrine of the *laissez-faire*, non-interventionist state. They had been compelled to accept the idea that the state in North America must clear and prepare the way for the beneficent operations of the capitalist. In the past this had meant the lavish construction of roads and canals; and now it came to imply substantial contributions to railways. In the Maritimes, partly through choice and partly through necessity, the state itself frankly undertook the construction and management of its new transport system. In the Province of Canada, where the Northern, the Great Western, and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies were supposedly independent commercial concerns, the state subsidized, rehabilitated, and revived these enterprises with a frequency which almost earned it the title of ownership. All this involved what to British North America was a new and alarming drain upon the treasury; and when the capital imports incidental to railway building had ceased, and the depression of 1857 had descended, the customs revenue dwindled alarmingly. The province, as its financier Galt explained, had cheapened the cost of British manufactures in Canada, and enhanced the value of Canadian products in England, by

its expenditures on canals and railways. The traffic therefore could very well bear an increased toll. The government needed the money. And, to make a long story short, it proposed to raise the tariff.

Thus the Cayley-Galt tariff of 1858-9 was one of the first results of the railway construction programme. But there was, in addition, another important consequence which perhaps had not been anticipated by even the most hard-headed of the farmers and merchants who had wanted the railways in the first place. The railway boom provided the basis for the new industrialism in British North America. It brought, in volume and numbers such as had never been seen before, the new industrial materials, the new industrial techniques, the new industrial labourers. There was a widening of the economic horizon, a quickening of the tempo of economic life; and the little provincial foundries and manufacturies profited from the better markets of the period, and also from the high prices which were partly a result of the Crimean War and partly of the railway boom itself. The little colonial establishments profited; but not, unhappily, as much as they could have wished. Even while the boom was at its height, they were astonished and outraged to discover how much of the profits of Canadian railway construction were going into the pockets of American manufacturers. "The very spades and shovels, axes and hammers used by the workmen and labourers were of American make," wrote one contemporary with indignation. As Galt had intimated, the Canadian canals and the American and Canadian railways were already removing the natural shelter of the northern manufacturers. Their situation had been annoying enough during the boom; it was far worse when the depression of 1857 brought a collapse of prices. They suffered; but this time they suffered in highly important company, for their distress coincided with the financial embarrassment of the government. They desired a higher tariff for protection: the government desired it for increased revenue. And the result of this happy union of sentiments was the Cayley-Galt customs duties of 1858-9. Thus, on the eve of the American Civil War, an important qualification had already been introduced into the traditional commercial policy of British North America. The provinces stood committed to a system of low tariffs and reciprocal preferences. But Canada had abruptly increased her duties with protectionist approval though ostensibly for revenue purposes. This discrepancy was immediately detected in the United States. And disagreements might have followed this discovery, if all such problems had not been momentarily engulfed in the torrent of hatred unloosed by the American Civil War.

### III

For the next fifteen years, the American Civil War and its consequences constituted perhaps the dominant factor in British North American affairs. Nothing is more obvious now than that the new order of nationality and industrialism meant war; and nothing is more ironical than the conviction of its apologists that it meant peace. John Bright stood for pacification with the same moral earnestness that he opposed factory acts and denounced colonies. To these middle-class reformers war was unthinkable precisely because they had just succeeded in raising politics to such a high moral plane. As Mr. Gladstone said reverently of John Bright, he had "elevated political life to a higher elevation and to a loftier standard." The Manchester School introduced moral



earnestness into English politics: the American Slavery Abolitionists introduced moral indignation into North American affairs. Surely this ought to have improved human conduct; but the strange fact was that human conduct remained obstinately unregenerate. Far from becoming better, it seemed to be getting steadily worse. The aristocratic intriguers who met at the Congress of Vienna had given Great Britain nearly forty years of peace. But the ushering in of the Manchester men's millenium was followed almost immediately by the Crimean War; and the great humanitarian crusade of the Abolitionists ended in a bloody civil conflict. From 1854 to 1878, the bulk of the period covered by this paper, there were few years indeed which did not see armed struggle among the great powers of Europe and America.

In many ways, which cannot be examined here, the American Civil War was destined to effect the development of British America. Its influence, for example, on the formation of commercial policy was decisive in the end. So far as the Province of Canada was concerned, it helped from the start to promote the industrial growth which had begun during the previous decade. "I trust," said James Watson, President of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario at a special meeting held in 1875, "I trust that it will be borne in mind that the rapid development of manufacturing [in this country] during the past few years is almost entirely due to the peculiar position of the United States from the commencement of the late civil war." Inevitably the war and the economic dislocation resulting from it focused the manufacturing industry of the United States upon the home market and limited its export trade. In all probability there were a good many Canadian manufacturers like Edward Gurney of the Gurney Stove Company who declared in 1876 that his business had quadrupled since 1861 and that, in effect, it was the war-time rise in values in the United States which had sufficed to give him the home market.

Thus one result of the war was to increase the number of people in the Province of Canada who were likely in future to want a protective tariff. Its far more important consequence, however, was to complete the supremacy of those interests in the United States which would never again submit to such a measure as the Reciprocity Treaty. The war was a struggle between an awakening industrial society and a planter community, a struggle for nationality against local independence. And its result, as Parrington has said, was to throw "the coercive powers of a centralizing state into the hands of the new industrialism." The men who stood for transcontinental railways, large-scale manufacture, and western exploitation were to determine, in large measure, the pattern of future American development. They represented unification and expansion within the country and imperialism without. The purchase of Alaska, the freely expressed desire for the annexation of British North America, are evidences of this renewed impulse towards territorial aggrandizement. The establishment of a passport system for the first time against the northern provinces, the threat to repeal the Rush-Bagot Treaty limiting naval armaments on the Great Lakes, the proposal to stop the bonding privileges for trade through United States territory—all illustrate a new truculence of tone.

Again, as in the case of England, commercial policy summed up and expressed the character of the new America which arose from the wreckage of the Civil War. Before the conflict began, the new Re-

publican party had declared in favour of a protective tariff. The financial necessities of the war brought an enormous increase in the customs duties: and the need for war-time goods and services gave an immense impetus to manufacturing. When the war was over, the tariff was unquestioningly continued as one of the sacred institutions of the unified continental state. In home affairs, it expressed the victory of the industrial North over the agrarian South: in external relations, it signified the triumph of national exclusiveness over international co-operation. In such circumstances as these the Reciprocity Treaty had inevitably to disappear. In the winter of 1866, when the British Americans journeyed down to Washington, in the vain hope of negotiating a new agreement, Mr. Morrill, the principal author of the new American tariff, had only a very singular proposal to make to them. He proposed that, in return for the inshore fisheries and the navigation of the St. Lawrence and its canals, the United States would consider reciprocal free trade in five articles of great commercial importance. These articles were: unfinished millstones and grindstones, gypsum, firewood, and rags.

The tremendous alteration in the whole position of British North America had now been brought to an end. The change had begun with the downfall of the Old Colonial System of Great Britain: it had been completed by the wreck of the old federal system of the United States. The insignificant northern provinces were now flanked by two re-organized consolidated nationalities, heavily industrialized, each of which had adopted a realistic political and commercial policy in its own exclusive interest. In the complete absence, in the apparent impossibility of those reciprocal preferences which had supported the St. Lawrence route in the past, what hope was there for an international commercial system based upon it? Even under the favourable circumstances of the past, the St. Lawrence had never really won the trade of the American Middle West; and there was all the more reason now why it could never do so. This collapse of the old hopes in the wreckage of the old world of trade and politics brought the provinces to the threshold of economic and political nationalism. In the light of the successful examples around them, they saw now how they could use the new concepts of union and expansion as the United States had adapted them for the North American continent. They decided upon a strongly centralized federal union: they determined upon transcontinental railways and the opening of the West. All this was pretty strictly in accordance with the programme which had been developed in the United States during and after the Civil War. But there was one significant difference. There was no lofty protective tariff. In Canada, the decisive change in commercial policy had yet to come.

The fact was that for a decade longer the new federation still clung obstinately to the old economic notions which had been the stand-by of the provinces. The interests of the state, and the interests of the principal groups composing it, seemed still to be satisfied with a moderate commercial policy. In the Maritimes, the financial pressure of railway and railway commitments might have forced up the customs duties; and actually, just before Confederation, the tariff in New Brunswick was probably the highest in British North America. But, on the other hand, the revenue position in the Province of Canada was easier; and in 1866, as a pre-Confederation concession to opinion in the Maritimes, it lowered the level of the old Cayley-Galt duties. The manufacturers



of Canada strongly protested this reduction; but in general the agricultural, commercial, and railway interests were stronger; and both in Canada and the Maritimes they still wanted what Galt called "modified free trade." They put their hopes in the free-trade area of four million people which Confederation would create. They expected that they could make arrangements for preferential exchange of goods with the West Indies and South America. And, of course, they obstinately continued to believe that in the end they would yet get a new Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

Yet twelve years after Confederation the National Policy was an established fact. The twin pressures, internal and external, continued to act in unison: and together they were driving the new Dominion towards the complete American variant of economic nationalism. Gradually the hope of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States was crushed out of existence by repeated disappointments. Macdonald failed to obtain a new arrangement at the time of the Washington Treaty: George Brown was unsuccessful in the negotiations of 1874. While the prospect of these international agreements faded, the idea of national exclusiveness had already begun to grow. The phrase "a national policy for Canada" appears as early as 1869. By the next year it has become definitely associated with the tariff. In the election of 1872 Macdonald made an open appeal to manufacturers and workingmen with a proposal to support domestic industry with a protective tariff. In the Maritimes, and in old commercial towns like Montreal, the trading interests were strongly intrenched and resisted stoutly; but Hamilton, Toronto, and the other industrial centres of the future were already converted or half-converted to the new views. All this had occurred while prosperity still ruled and while American manufactures had yet to enter the Canadian market in volume. After 1873 the drift towards protection became accelerated and irresistible. The situation was in many respects analogous to that which had existed in the Province of Canada in 1857-9 when the first Canadian protective tariff had come into being. Again depression had exposed the weaknesses of Canadian industry: again the mass-production American manufacturers had invaded the northern market: and again the Canadian government was badly in need of funds. There was one major difference, however—a difference which aggravated rather than alleviated the problem in the 1870's. In 1857-9, British North America had enjoyed a reciprocal commercial agreement with the United States. Now there was no Reciprocity Treaty and no prospect of one. The forces of industrialism and nationality, internal and external to British North America, had finished their work. And the Dominion of Canada completed its programme of national unification with the National Policy of Protection.

## THE FAILURE OF THE HISTORIANS<sup>1</sup>

By H. N. FIELDHOUSE  
*The University of Manitoba*

THE failure from which this paper takes its title is that of English-speaking historians—taken as a body, and in the last twenty years—to have made any contribution to the discussion of current international affairs at all commensurate with what might, as I think, have been expected from them.

In pointing to that failure, I must ask not to be taken as implying more than I mean, and it would be well, perhaps, therefore, if I first made clear what I emphatically do *not* mean.

In the first place, I am not suggesting that the historian has, or can be expected to have, any necessary superiority in the discussion of international affairs. A man may turn historian merely through liking for academic life or through a slightly "escapist" curiosity about antiquity, or simply as a means of earning a livelihood, and none of these things has any necessary connection with that native sagacity which is required for the conduct of foreign policy. It is true that, by reason of his training, the historian should be in a position to say something of value about foreign affairs, but then, the relations of modern states involve so many factors that there are many other people, not historians, who, by virtue of *their* training (as soldiers, economists, etc.) are also in a position to say something valuable; and if it be said that there must be someone to put all these contributions together, that someone (have we any equivalent for the French "philosophe"?) may well be found anywhere among the general body of educated men. No amount of historical training can create judgment where none is in-born.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, I must not be understood as pleading for the study of that contradiction in terms, contemporary history. Courses in very recent history do appear in our curricula (including the curriculum for which I am responsible) but, for myself, I regard such courses as concessions to necessity rather than as things which are desirable in themselves. I think that training in historical method is best obtained by the study of periods which are more remote. For it is here that we touch on one of the many differences between the historian and, for example, the journalist. The journalist will tell you that he is accustomed to dealing with conflicts of evidence; but the historian of past ages is accustomed to dealing with something which is more important; he is accustomed to dealing with gaps in the evidence, and to making a sharp distinction, therefore, (as the journalist—with his "it is well known in certain circles"—or his "we are credibly informed"—or his

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this paper, I have used the first person singular. I am aware of the objections to this practice, but as this paper is an expression of personal opinion, considerations of honesty seemed to preclude the use of the editorial "we," and considerations of style weighed heavily against the repeated use of such circumlocutions as "the present writer," "the writer of this paper," etc.

<sup>2</sup>In Bolingbroke's view, "The study of history without experience is insufficient." He went on to assert what, to me, is a more important truism, "that experience itself is insufficient without genius"; meaning by genius, in this connection, I take it, the innate ability to profit by experience.



"there is reason to believe"—does not distinguish) between the places where he is on firm ground and the places where he has gone on to inference or guess-work. So that I beg that I may not be confused with the advocates of history-up-to-the-minute.

Thirdly, it may be suspected that an amateur of Bolingbroke has adopted his subject's maxim that "history is philosophy teaching by examples," and—even if, lacking the eighteenth-century assurance, he cannot now, like the eighteenth-century aristocrat, dismiss research on the Middle Ages as "learned lumber"—is about to urge that it is modern history which should be emphasized, and that even modern history should be studied chiefly because it is politically useful. This last, if I understand him rightly, was Seeley's view, and I can only say that I think its practice is studded with pitfalls. It may be true, as Sir Richard Lodge declared, that "few things are more likely to contribute to the stability . . . of a democratic state than the training of its members by an intelligent study of history," but Sir Richard was careful to add that it is the historian's business "to supply knowledge rather than convictions; to furnish his students with the means of forming their own judgments, and not to force down their throats his own opinions"; and I think that most of us will agree that it is precisely as we get nearer to the present time that it is hardest to get our students to deal in knowledge and not in convictions; hardest to teach them that it is just possible that they may be mistaken. The English student seems likely to learn the methods of dispassionate enquiry more easily from a study of Anglo-French relations under Danby than from a study of the same relations under Curzon, because, in the first case, his national, and other, prejudices are less likely to be involved; and even the Marxist undergraduate—and which of our classes is without him?—can sometimes be persuaded to tolerate a seminar in method, provided that it deals with a period which is remote enough from that of the prophet.

The view that we should use history as a source from which to draw practical lessons, which will enable us to construct a science of politics, passes easily into the view that we should study the past primarily as a means of explaining the present, a doctrine which seems to me to be at least as dangerous, if not so obviously so, as the older doctrines which would have used history to teach religion, or civic morality or patriotism. In my own teaching, I find that possibly my greatest difficulty is to prevent my students from imposing, on all the complexities of the past, an artificial and arbitrarily simplified pattern which is vaguely associated with their idea of "progress." They know little or nothing of the scientific doctrine of evolution, properly so called, but, like most people of the last four generations, they have a vague idea that "Science," through its affirmation of the idea of evolution, has somehow given a final sanction to the idea of automatic and inevitable human progress; so that they approach English history, for example, as though it were like the unrolling of a carpet which had proceeded from Alfred to Mr. Gladstone in an undeviating and inevitable straight line, and as a manifestation of a single principle.

With this audience, I need not labour the point that such an approach is radically unhistorical. Its obvious defect is that it treats each period in the past, not for itself, but merely as a stepping-stone to its successor, and leaves us, as Chesterton pointed out, perpetually on our knees to our own grandsons. This, in turn, means that we select for emphasis,

in each century, those developments which (as, from our later vantage point, we now know) were most palpably leading on to the next century. Thus, because we know that Parliament was to emerge victorious from its seventeenth-century conflict with the Crown, we take care to understand the case of Parliament, but somewhat less care to understand the case of the Crown; whereas the "actual" seventeenth century was both—both the cause of Parliament and the cause of the Crown.

In the same way, we are led to pick out, and to emphasize, in any period, the sanguine, forward-looking personalities or groups because, again from our later vantage ground, we know that it was their ideas which were to gain acceptance. Quite apart from the question of whether we go on to idealize these "winning" tendencies or not, it seems to me to be bad, historically, that they should even be emphasized. For the "real" seventeenth century was not merely Pym and Shaftesbury and the elder Sunderland; it was at least equally—some might say, more typically—Hyde and Danby and Halifax; for if it takes two to make a quarrel, it emphatically took two to make a past quarrel, losers as well as winners; and it is limping history, surely, which only concerns itself with understanding the winners. The Elizabethan-Cavalier ideal of a real King-in-Parliament—a sagacious sovereign at one with a loyal and faithful Commons—was to become outmoded; but is it not defective Tudor and Stuart history which fails to examine an ideal which was held by so many Tudor and Stuart Englishmen? Government-by-party was to replace government-above-party; but a history of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries which omits the fact that the latter idea was held by Englishmen as important as Marlborough and Godolphin and Shrewsbury and Harley, is surely mutilated history? The extremes to which the "history-to-explain-the-present" school can go can be seen in Mr. Wells, who first projects an ideal of his own imagining into the future, and then proceeds to approach all past history in terms of that ideal, awarding marks for good conduct to those individuals who appear to him to have been tending towards his private ideal, and contemptuously dismissing those (for example, Napoleon) who were not.

Lastly, this viewing of the past in terms of the present<sup>3</sup> leads us to attribute to past generations a conscious foresight of the consequences of their action which they did not possess. I need not, again, remind this audience of the more obvious examples; the tendency, because seventeenth-century puritanism contained some germs of modern democracy, to see the puritans as modern democrats or, at least, as men who saw themselves as the forerunners of modern democracy; the tendency to attribute to the parliamentary opposition under Elizabeth and James I—that is to say, to men who were feeling their way with a great deal of honest bewilderment, and among particular issues—a clear conception of what their opposition was to mean for the future interpretation of the constitution as a whole. This, it seems to me, is the great value of requiring our students to read contemporary sources; that they may see what the activities of a Peter Wentworth or a Coke

---

<sup>3</sup>Professor R. L. Schuyler has pointed out that there is all the more need to be on our guard against this view, because it is the attitude which comes most naturally to those who are not historically trained. See his thoughtful "History in a Changing World" (*British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, V, 4).



meant to a Wentworth or a Coke, as distinct from what, as we can see now, they were to mean for generations which were yet to come. As Mathiez put it: "My whole effort has consisted in withdrawing myself as much as possible from our present ways of thinking and judging in order to find again those of the men of the 18th century. . . . The historian ought not to question the past with formulas of the present."

I apologize for this lengthy preface, but it has been necessary to say so much in order to anticipate the more obvious criticism of what I am about to argue. I hope that I have made it clear that this paper is not going to claim that "history teaches this or that," since there will be very real differences among historians as to what it does teach. I hope that I have made it clear that I realize that the historian is fallible, and that when we are told that philosophy is the study of other peoples' opinions, and history the study of other peoples' mistakes, it is not always easy to parry the comment that they have often been the mistakes of the historians. More especially, I hope that I have made it clear that I no more wish to see history treated as the handmaiden of politics than I wish to see it made the tool of religious or patriotic propaganda. I hope that this meeting will agree with Professor Tout that "we investigate the past not to deduce practical political lessons; but to find out what really happened"; even if we add that we realize the impossibility of ever finding out the whole of what happened. In my view, history for history's sake is a perfectly tenable position.

## II

Having disagreed, however, with all those schools which insist on the immediate "utility" of history, I would still suggest that the study of history, though pursued for its own sake, may yet have, as its by-products, three attitudes of mind which might be expected to show themselves in the historian when he steps outside his trade and speaks as a citizen.

The first of these three is the perception of difference. Those who use history to explain the present tend to emphasize likeness. They seek in the Middle Ages for motives which they can recognize as being those which, in their opinion, move men today, and if we point to different motives, they dismiss them as being either non-essentials or more or less consciously-adopted disguises. They look in the seventeenth century for the ideas which were clearly leading into the eighteenth, and if we draw attention to other ideas in the tangled seventeenth-century skein, they dismiss them as having been held only by "reactionaries" who were soon to be left behind by "progress." Now I think it will be agreed that the moment any one of us really embarks on research into the contemporary materials of any period, the thing by which he is struck is not likeness but difference; the fact (I apologize for the triteness of the examples) that thirteenth-century barons did not mean by "liberty" what Locke was to mean by it; that the Speakers of Henry VIII's parliaments did not mean by "freedom of speech" what the Speakers of Charles II's parliaments were to mean by it; and so on.

The second, which in some sort follows from the first, is tolerance; tolerance of cultures and of attitudes of mind which are different from our own. For example, we ourselves are the heirs of a civilization in which, since the Renaissance, secular culture has emancipated itself from the tutelage of the Church and created an independent "order"

of humanistic inquiry and science; and in which, since the industrial revolution, economic life has emancipated itself from the other traditional historic organization, the State, and created the thing which we know as the capitalist order. The Middle Ages, on the contrary, whatever their practice, could not, in idea, conceive of these autonomous "orders"—cultural, economic, political—each self-justificatory and each pursuing its ends without any reference to any over-riding religious and moral purpose. The historian of the mediaeval period, therefore, finds himself, on the one hand, living in a society which assumes that the appetite for economic gain is a constant force and that society itself is nothing more than a mechanism which adjusts itself through the play of economic motives to the supply of economic needs, and on the other, studying a civilization which treated society as a community of unequal classes, each with its own function, but all organized for a common and moral end; and to me, at least, it seems improbable that a man should study, for example, things so different as the views of the Schoolmen and those of the classical economists, and not have the borders of his tolerance enlarged.

For tolerance is surely first cousin to understanding, and it is the business of the historian to understand underlying conditions. When he encounters the Divine Right of Kings, for example, it is not his business, I hope, to remark on how silly such a doctrine (if taken literally) must appear in 1942; it is his business to inquire what it was in that doctrine which made it acceptable, in 1542, to men who (his researches will probably have impelled him to feel) were at least as intelligent and honest as ourselves. Few régimes, either past or present, have been able to deny themselves excursions into philosophical thought with the object of rationalizing their practice; and while it is the business of the political philosopher to point out that these excursions have often left much to be desired, and that these rationalizations have sometimes been quite remarkably irrational, it is the business of the historian, I take it, to depict the régime with which the doctrines were associated, rather than to examine the coherence with which they were expressed. For most generations have lived in the light of some fiction, and whether the fiction be the Divine Right of Popes, of Kings, or of the people unified according to Rousseau, our business is to record the origin and consequences of the fiction and to relate it to the *conditions* which went with it. "Tout comprendre, c'est tout pardonner" must come very near to being the essential temper of the historian.

The third conception which, as it seems to me, must be borne in upon the historian, is that of unity and continuity. J. B. Bury said that the great transforming conception which enables history to define her scope is the idea of development, and it was a Russian historian, I think, who said that history does not leap. If someone were to say that a lively sense of the truth of this principle would make the historian (in his capacity as citizen) a liberal-conservative, advocating liberal reform upon conservative grounds, I am not sure that I should not agree.

This, then, is my position: that the historian, as such, has no special connection with, or aptitude for, politics: that if he cares to pursue his researches into, shall we say, the incidence of the land tax in Norfolk under William III and to eschew discussion of current affairs, he is entitled to do so: but that if, and when, he does speak of "affairs" as



a citizen, it might be expected that he should make a special contribution because of those attitudes of mind which his particular training is calculated to nourish, and of which I have named three. It is my complaint that, by and large, and with some conspicuous exceptions, when we have come down into the market place in the last twenty years, our utterances have been indistinguishable from those of our contemporaries who have not had our advantages.

### III

The first attribute which I suggested might be looked for in the historian-turned-citizen was the perception of difference. For the educated layman, on the other hand, there has possibly never been a time when perception of differences was so blurred. The educated man of the eighteenth century was very much alive to what Bolingbroke called the different "manners, customs and interests of particular nations," but we have lived in an intellectual climate inherited from that nineteenth-century liberalism which, beginning with the assumption that, if you give all men free institutions, you make all men free, came near to assuming that, if you give all men the same institutions, you make all men the same; and there was a time in the 1920's when it was the mark of a "progressive" mind to act not merely as though we could all love one another, but as though we could all be one another.

Now without committing myself to any theory of immutable "national characters," I suggest that historians could have been of service by reminding our people that words and ideas do undergo a sea-change when they pass from a people with one historical experience to a people with another.

One of the causes of ill-will, for some years past, has been the confusion which surrounds the use of the word "democracy." In domestic affairs, we have the problem of how to reconcile the rule of law with the rule of the popular will, when modern democracy has made it plausible to attack the first in the sacred name of the second. In foreign affairs, we are confronted with the contradiction that the totalitarian régimes are undoubtedly democratic in the sense that they have the support of the mass of their subjects, and yet do things which, in our sense of the term, are undemocratic. Would the contradiction have been quite so bewildering if we had made clear the different origins of democracy in England and democracy on the Continent?

An audience of historians will agree, I hope, that the things which Englishmen imply when they use the word democracy—our parliamentary form of government and our ideals of personal freedom—are not democratic in origin: they are a legacy which our modern industrial democracy received from an older agrarian and aristocratic England. The essence of our constitutionalism—the limitation of the power of government by law—was enforced, not by the "people" acting on any theory of the Rights of Man, but partly by the substantial gentry and merchants of the seventeenth century, defending their rights at common law against the King, and partly by our religious sects, each with its distinctive social tradition, and each prepared to defend a certain religious way of life against King or Parliament alike.

The importance of these two elements—aristocratic Liberalism and sectarian Independency—in shaping the pattern of English freedoms

cannot, in my opinion, be exaggerated, and even today, enough of that pattern survives to prevent England from being a democracy in the Continental sense. If she ever becomes so, I suspect that our two hundred years of peaceful development may come to an end, and that those who love law and liberty may once more have to fight to secure what Coke called "somewhat fundamental"—those liberties at common law which the divine right of the People can no more be trusted not to try to over-ride than the divine right of kings. For liberty understood as the right of the mass to power, and liberty as the right of the individual or group to the highest degree of self-development, are not easily reconciled. Liberty, historically, has been an aristocratic ideal, and it is no accident that England, the home of political liberty and of parliamentary institutions, should possess the strongest and most continuous tradition of aristocratic government.

If we would realize how far she is from being a democracy in the historic sense, we can look across the Channel, where pure democracy did enter Western history with Rousseau and the Jacobins, and it is significant for our present purpose that the Jacobins anticipated nearly all the features of the totalitarian régimes of today: the dictatorship of a party in the name of the nation, the use of propaganda and terrorism, the idea of revolutionary justice as a social weapon, the regulation of economic life in order to promote revolutionary ideals, and, especially, the persecution of all dissenters.<sup>4</sup> The genuine Continental liberals, in our sense of the term—Royer-Collard, Benjamin Constant, de Tocqueville—were so horrified by their experience of this first reality of mass democracy that they did all that they could to limit the power and prestige of the community in favour of the individual.

When "democracy" is at stake, then, I suggest that we have meant democracy according to Selden and Locke, while the Continent has meant democracy according to Rousseau, and that from this difference has come the unhappy exchange of the last decade in which, quite genuinely, we have vilified the totalitarian states as being anti-democratic, while they, with equal sincerity, have retorted that they are the real democracies. It was probably too much to expect historians to make clear to the man-in-the-street that both were right; but could we not have said it, at least, to our intelligentsia?

Not only has the history of democracy in England been different from its history on the Continent: the history of Liberalism in England has been different from the history of Liberalism on the Continent. In England, the dominant strains in Liberalism have taken a strongly religious cast, and the historic Liberal party was always closely associated with the Nonconformist churches. On the Continent, or at any rate on the Latin Continent, the dominant note in Liberalism has been anti-clericalism; and this historic fact that, in modern times, English Liberalism has always had a strong evangelical flavour, while in France, for example, its temper has been Voltairian, still leads to confusion.

---

<sup>4</sup>Since this paper was written, the latest historian of the Committee of Public Safety has suggested that the democracy of 1793-4, with its ideals of universal suffrage and increasing economic equality "raised the most portentous of political questions: the relation between democracy in this sense and democracy in the other sense, the democracy of individual liberties and representative government" (R. R. Palmer, *Twelve who Ruled*, Princeton, 1941).



At the present moment, almost every article which is written on English relations with the Continent betrays some desire to base these relations on some ideological preference, and few of them take account of the fact that, as the lines cross the Channel—because of this historic “accident” by which, in England alone, Christianity and Liberalism have gone together, while on the Continent they have been opposed—they become crossed. If we were really to base policy upon international ideas, our “natural” allies against German paganism would be the Christian parties of Europe; but such parties, for historical reasons, are usually socially and politically conservative to a degree which makes it difficult for our Liberals to work with them. Yet to ally with the forces which are labelled “Liberal” on the Continent, is to join with forces which are either anti-Christian (as in France) or terrorist (as in Spain) and which, so far from being Liberal in the English Gladstonian sense, are liable to persecute fellow-men (as in both France and Spain) for no other reason than that these profess and call themselves Christians.

Again, it is natural that minds which are always seeking for, and assuming, “likeness,” should look in foreign countries for the groups which most resemble themselves and should proceed to base policy on those groups. It is natural, but in the case of England, it is nevertheless dangerous. For the temper and outlook of England on the one side, and of France or Germany, for example, on the other, have been shaped by historical experiences so profoundly different that, almost by definition, a French or German group which comes near to sharing our dominant ideas and presuppositions, is likely to be,—if not actually anti-national—at any rate, unrepresentative of France or Germany as a whole and, in the long run, therefore, an unstable pivot on which to base policy. In practice, and since 1919, it has meant that we have tended to lean upon, and deal with, the Centre parties on the Continent, who alone, in any measure, shared our temper; and there is no need to recall what happened to those parties when the political winds arose.

Once more, I am not suggesting that historians, as such, should have advocated this policy or that; but I do suggest that we could have done service by indicating (as we are particularly fitted to indicate) that the whole tenor of the past has given a very different meaning to the same words when used by different peoples, and that policy will have to take account of that fact.

#### IV

The case of France may illustrate, also, the application of my third attribute of the historian, the perception of continuity or of the effects of the “compulsion of the past.” It has been saddening, as well as alarming, to watch the surprise of our intelligentsia at the events which have followed in France since the summer of 1940. Mr. Wickham Steed, for example, has recently written: “Something deeper than a temporary loss of nerve must have prompted the . . . surrender of Marshal Pétain and his associates. Deliberately and consciously they repudiated the legacy of the French Revolution of 1789 . . . and all the principles which the makers of the Third Republic vindicated. Similar principles were at stake in the Dreyfus Affair which, at the turn of the century, brought France to the verge of civil war. Then the Dreyfusards triumphed over the forces of ‘reaction.’ Now the behaviour of the Men of Vichy has been shrewdly defined as ‘the revenge of the anti-Dreyfusards.’ Evi-

dently the roots of 'reaction' in France lie deeper and are stronger than there seemed valid reason to suppose."

Here, again, one can only say that whoever else had "valid reason" to suppose that the "roots of reaction" were not strong and deep in France, the historian had not. Germany, Russia, and Italy have all, in our time, undergone violent revolutions and produced new and exciting "isms," with the result that our people have been shocked into taking an interest in them. In the case of France, however, it was taken for granted that we knew all about her. True, she had had her own great revolution, but that was 150 years ago, and it is not surprising, since we did so little to enlighten them, that our people should not have known that the ground swell of that revolution is running yet.

Yet this was the country in which few parliamentary candidates ever opened a speech without going back to "the principles of 1789," and where one politician could still make it a charge against another that his ancestor had been on the "wrong" side at Valmy; the country, in short, in which the profound divisions left behind by the great Revolution had never passed into French history because they had never passed out of French politics; and whoever else did not know this, we might have expected to have been reminded of it by the professional students of Mathiez and Aulard. Whoever else took the permanence and stability of the Third Republic for granted, we, who teach nineteenth-century history, had reason to know that conservative and Catholic France had long been excluded from any part in public life; to know that the Republicans had retorted to this part-voluntary, part-enforced abstention with the "République des Camarades," with a régime, that is to say, which, at best, meant "the Republic owes justice to all; jobs only to its friends," and which at worst, meant "All the jobs and quick about it."<sup>5</sup> We, at least, had reason to suspect, therefore, that there might yet be a "revenge of the anti-Dreyfusards."

Just as the man in the street, confronted since 1940 with a French régime which does not suit our convenience, treats it as a manifestation, not of French history but of evil, so, since 1933, he has treated German Nazism as a manifestation, not of German history, but of evil. Evil, in my opinion, it is, but is it not also a manifestation of German history, and would it not have made a great deal of difference to the way in which we have dealt with the evil, if—instead of judging it in terms of some standard derived from our own very different experience—we had remembered the history; the history of a people set between the policy of France which would cantonize Germany by using the German South as its own, and the Slavs who lap about the German bastions; the history of a people which has never aspired, save very faintly, to the Liberalism which is ours?

There is plenty of inquiry into German history going on now, chiefly, I am afraid, with the very immediate aim of tracing the unpleasant parentage of Nazi ideas from the *Aufklärung* onwards. But what of the wider streams of German history—the history of a people "which

---

<sup>5</sup>Recall General André's scheme for using Grand Orient Masons in the Army to spy upon their Catholic fellow-officers, a procedure which Captain Mollin justified as making for efficiency since "the brain which is able to adapt itself well to the republican idea should, by that very fact, . . . be superior . . . to the brain which evolves towards the monarchical idea, which is an idea of stagnation and tradition. . . ." (D. W. Brogan, *The Development of Modern France*, London, 1940), 382.



has reached from Trieste to the Baltic; which met the Middle Kingdom behind Strassburg and the Cossacks on the marches of the Ukraine; which has drawn its inspiration at different times from Aachen or from Innsbruck, from Vienna or from Graz, from Prague or from Berlin, but which has never known a single heart; of a people formidable because its limbs are vast and spreading, yet whose unity has been precarious because these limbs have intertwined or clashed with alien growths or have given rise to distortions of their own”?

Again, I do not think that it was the historian’s business to teach policy, but I wish that more of us had insisted that “history does not leap”: that the German present had grown out of the German past and that, whatever else we did with it, therefore, to pretend to deal with it as something imposed on the German people in their sleep, and from which it would be a kindness to kick them awake, was apt to be taken in Germany itself as mere impertinence.

The public attitude to foreign countries tends to take shape in alternating fits of likes and dislikes, the fits being alike in being all too emphatic and in missing the point. From Edward III to Edward VII, being more or less permanently at war with France, we held a settled distaste, not only for French policies (which was natural) but also for French diet, French manners, and French sports (which did not necessarily follow); but once Lord Lansdowne (with some debatable assistance from Edward the Peacemaker) had made the Entente, we discovered the excellence of French civilization. The discovery was admirable in itself, but, as has been well said, it was perhaps a misfortune that we should have had to collide with Germany in order to discover the truth about the French. In the same way, the people who could only screw themselves up to the task of fighting Germany (1914-18) by assuring themselves that all Germans were Huns, were naturally the people who (post-1918) could only bring themselves to make peace with Germany by electing to believe that our late enemies were all angels and our late allies all rogues; and—to cite no other examples—when, in 1939, a London newspaper informed its readers that Turkey had always had an enviable reputation in the matter of keeping her word, it was difficult not to feel that this belated tribute to a deeply religious people was not unconnected with the fact that they had just become our allies.

To all this hectic swinging of the pendulum, to all this rudderless judging of a foreign nation according to what it is doing today and irrespective of what it did yesterday and may, therefore, do again tomorrow, the historian is peculiarly fitted to supply the corrective. For he has a fund of recorded yesterdays; he, at any rate, is aware that there were heroes before (and after) Agamemnon, and he has studied the past of foreign nations, not for its effect upon us but for its own sake. It could be wished that we who have been trained to understand other ages, across the gulf of time, had more frequently, and more publicly exercised this habit of understanding across the gulf of frontiers. Even for the purpose of fighting other people, it seems better to understand them.

## V

I suggested that one of the attitudes of mind which is developed by the study of history is that of relating an institution or a policy to the conditions which accompanied it or gave rise to it. Could we not

have done more to make clear this connection—between a thing and its underlying condition—in some of the controversies which have filled the last twenty years?

For two hundred years before 1914, British foreign policy had rested upon three keystones: naval supremacy, the balance of power on the Continent, and abstention from Continental commitments. In application, these had come to mean the two-Power naval standard and a diplomacy aiming at the prevention of disputes among the Great Powers and the localization of such disputes if they arose. Between 1919 and 1922, these traditional policies were swept away. By the acceptance of parity with the next strongest naval power, British naval supremacy was ended. By the acceptance of the obligations of the Covenant of the League of Nations, a policy of abstention from commitments was exchanged for one of acceptance of commitments of the widest sort; a policy of seeking to localize conflicts for one of generalizing them; and a policy of upholding the balance of European power for one which must, in practice, destroy the balance.

Now—and again let me emphasize this—I do not think that it was the business of the historian to approve or condemn this change. I do think that it might have been his business to signalize it. The journalists could be relied upon to draw attention to the Russian and German revolutions, because they made a noise in the world, but here was a silent revolution, at least as momentous in its consequences for the world, and it passed unnoticed. I do not think that it was our business to attack or defend this revolution. I think that it might have been our business to point out that it had taken place; to relate the traditional policies to the conditions in which they had been embedded, and the new policies to the new conditions.

As it is, public discussion of foreign policy in the English-speaking world has gone on for twenty years as though completely unaware that what had been done did involve a profound revolution; half the public demanding the new policies while assuming that the old conditions remain, and the other half seeking to apply the old policies under the new conditions. The journalists had never known what the connection was between the historic policies and the conditions which led to their adoption, and they had some excuse for asking, for example, that, at one and the same time, the government should act to preserve the balance of power and also uphold a Covenant which was destructive of that balance, or should put at the service of the new policy, the naval supremacy which had only been tolerated by the rest of Europe because we had used it to promote the old policy. But we who have studied the *foundations* of British policy had the less excuse.

Again, and without taking sides in the controversies which have centred round the League of Nations, was there no contribution to those controversies which the historian was particularly equipped to make? It was left to the Marquess of Crewe to remind us that, at the turn of the century, "world opinion" regarded the United States as the "aggressor" in the Spanish-American War, and Britain as the "aggressor" in the South African War; and—to descend from Privy Councillors to professors—I have sometimes reminded myself that if the League had been in existence in 1860, it would have been bound to condemn (and, presumably, to call on British naval power to arrest) Garibaldi's expedition against Naples as a plain aggression against a



state with which Piedmont was officially at peace. Even had the historian done no more than remark on such reminders of the past, it would have been much. For the implications of these two reminders alone—the one, that the “aggressor” of one generation may be the “defender of order” in the next; the other, the age-old problem of reconciling the cause of “freedom” with the cause of peace—go to the root of more of our confusion in the last twenty years than is easily computed.

In the same way, it was natural enough that, in the years after 1919, the North American man-in-the-street should forget the combination of fortunate circumstances which had placed North America in a highly special position, should count unto himself for virtue, therefore, what was due to good luck, and should adopt, in addressing European states, an attitude of self-righteousness which always reminded Europeans of a millionaire addressing the poor; but the historians were in a position to know how much national policy owes to geography, and it is perhaps a pity that more of us here did not remind our public that, not innate righteousness, but the fact that, in Senator Dandurand’s words, a “fire-proof” curtain separated us from trouble, was at the bottom of much of our national outlook.<sup>6</sup>

## VI

I have already disavowed any wish to claim that history teaches this or that; but, even on this dangerous ground, I suggest that, if history cannot be safely used as material for prophecy, it may as a by-product afford some tentative hints.<sup>7</sup>

An historian reflecting, in the 1920’s, for example, on the role allotted by French policy to the states of the Little Entente and to Poland, might have recalled that there was a period when the same role was allotted by the same policy to Sweden, Turkey, and Poland, and that that policy was successful—until the point at which Prussia and Russia united against the French satellites. Such an historian would have been unwise to prophecy: but he would have had ground for thought.

In the same period, when so large a body of Anglo-Saxon opinion was acting upon the assumption that a defeated Germany would recognize that her defeat had been good for her because it would allow her “better elements” to slough off her Prussianism, an historian might have recalled the resurgence of a neurotic French nationalism some fifteen years after Waterloo, and the appearance of Boulangism some fifteen years after Sedan.<sup>8</sup> He would have been unwise, I think, to pretend to a pathology of nationalism, or to formulate any iron law of cause and

<sup>6</sup>Those were the years in which the unwearying repetition, by Canada at Geneva, of the invocation to European states to “regard the 3000 miles of undefended frontier and do likewise,” led a perhaps pardonably exasperated correspondent to assert that “nothing save the diplomatic politeness of the other delegates to the Assembly prevented them from asking Canada to go home and sit on the 3000 miles until she had learned another tune.”

<sup>7</sup>“From the point of view of common sense, the notion that historical events are wholly unique is simply not tenable . . . most ‘practical’ men habitually act upon what it is no mere quibble to call a study of historical uniformities. If they act as though their experience gave them absolute uniformities, they are certain to make grave mistakes. But they would make even graver ones if they assumed that each problem they faced was wholly unique and unprecedented” (Crane Brinton in *Foreign Affairs*, XX, 213).

<sup>8</sup>L. B. Namier, *In the Margin of History* (London, 1939).

effect between national defeat and national hysteria; but again, he would at least have had ground for inquiring more closely into the dominant assumption of the moment.

Lastly, I have made it clear, I hope, that I am very far from sharing the view of Professor Alison Phillips (then affording a pleasing exception to the maxim that the Conservatives make history and the Liberals write it) when he wrote, in 1920: "I confess that for me the chief value of history lies precisely in the light which it can throw on the problems of the present." But there is no need to share either the purpose or the conclusions of Professor Phillips's book,<sup>9</sup> in order to feel that a study of the attempt to organize international peace after 1815 was not without its significance for the parallel attempt of our own day.

## VII

My complaint, then, is twofold: that we, whose training makes for the perception of differences, and for tolerance and understanding across the gulf of time, have done less than we might have done to exercise these qualities across the gulf of space, and have too often given countenance to the natural popular habit of reading the assumptions born of our own history into the affairs of nations whose history has been profoundly different; and that we, whose training makes for the sense of continuity, have done less than we might have done to set the régimes or policies of other countries in the context of the continuous past of those countries, and so to do something to correct the ephemeral "fashions" of a public opinion which swings hectically between uninformed sympathy for another nation in one year, and equally uninformed antipathy to it in the next, not according to any considered knowledge of where the spiritual energies of that nation diverge from our own, but simply as its action, at the moment, does or does not suit our convenience.

It would be tempting to speculate on the reasons for this failure, but I have already started enough hares. One suggestion, however, might be hazarded. It seems possible that our economic materialism is in part responsible for corrupting our historical sense. The fashion for economic determinism may not have led us to deny the importance of ideas, but it has led many of us to explain them as being merely the derivatives of economic conditions, and there have been times and places in which to take the independent validity of ideas seriously was to be treated as either a romantic or a reactionary.<sup>10</sup>

Now whatever else is controversial about the economic determinists, I think that it will be agreed that they are "levellers"; that they tend to eliminate differences whether of place or time, because they ignore the things which change—ideas of Power, of Law and of the State—and concentrate upon the economic appetite which, like the sexual, is a constant; and I suggest that minds coloured by the tendency to reduce all men, everywhere, to a uniformity based on the universal presence of one appetite, have been in danger of losing that historical sense which has led an English publicist to write (with whatever exaggeration) of France, that "at bottom, all Latin politics are an expression of the

<sup>9</sup>*The Confederation of Europe* (London, 1920), vi.

<sup>10</sup>The recent historiography of the French Revolution, with the reception given to the work of Augustin Cochin and of Professor Brinton, affords a good example.



bitter, never-ending conflict between clerical and anti-clerical," and which has led the latest historian of German political thought to insist: "The basic tie between the individual and the society in which he lives is what he thinks about the ordering of society. The niceties of political theory may often seem remote from life, but ultimately it remains true that men behave in human society in accordance with their conception of that society and of their function in it. In the case of Germany this middle link, the distinctive outlook on society . . . springs from a very bold and imaginative corpus of thought . . . : the historical school."<sup>11</sup>

But with the Materialist Conception of History we leave history for sociology, and I could not do better, perhaps, than to conclude with the words of Sir William Ashley: "The general cultivated public . . . wants to know how individuals and episodes are related to some large whole, and what the significance of it all has been. If scholars competently trained will not try to satisfy this natural and laudable desire, incompetent writers will. . . . The historian . . . may expel nature with the fork of the Seminary . . . but Nemesis stands very near the shoulder of . . . 'Pure History'—and in America it usually calls itself Sociology."<sup>12</sup>

#### DISCUSSION

*Mr. Trotter* said that illustrations similar to those which *Mr. Fieldhouse* had drawn from the European scene, could also be drawn from the American scene. For example, in regard to the historian's obligation to perceive differences, the principal trend in the treatment of the history of the Americas during the last generation had involved an ignoring of differences in an eagerness to expand our horizons in this hemisphere and to exaggerate the importance of the term *American*. Similarly, historians as well as others had too often used the word *democracy* as though it were everywhere similar in content in this hemisphere.

Since the last war, *Mr. Trotter* said, some historians had been utopian about the hopes for a new world order, and had consequently been uncritical about the plans which were being made to bring it about. Others had reacted towards cynicism, and he wondered if this were any more valid than utopianism as an approach to history. If the historian's philosophy were either utopian or cynical, how could he hope to meet the standards suggested by *Mr. Fieldhouse*, and how could he be helpful to the people of his own day?

*Mr. Brebner* said: We must all be indebted to Professor Fieldhouse for maintaining in such lively fashion what has become a valuable convention of our annual meetings—the provocative presentation of a controversial subject in order to induce, at one session at least, an intellectual free-for-all among our members. His utterance and Professor Lower's of last year are so much more robust than our first experiments of ten or twelve years ago that I doubt whether I can keep up with them.

It comes as something of a surprise to find that an historian, whom most of us were accustomed to think of as spending his hours of self-indulgence in imaginary gossip with Bolingbroke at a London coffee-

<sup>11</sup>R. D'O. Butler, *The Roots of National Socialism* (London, 1941), 10.

<sup>12</sup>Quoted in B. E. Schmitt, (ed.) *Some Historians of Modern Europe* (Chicago, 1942), 35.

house, has, during the past two or three years, sharply focussed his attentions on the continent of Europe in its present throes. Perhaps still more surprising is the discovery that somehow or other during these years he has become a master of the technique of the bull-fight. You will notice that our programme committee has shrewdly estimated his capacities as an artistic killer by providing no less than three bulls to serve as sacrifices in behalf of our entire guild.

It is the nasty custom of the better bull-fighters to begin their dance of death by sticking barbed darts into the forequarters of their victim. Not only do these hurt, but they are adorned with fluttering ribbons which annoy and distract, and sometimes even with strings of fire-crackers which excite the glands whose secretions intensify anger and fear. I hope I may be absolved if I choose to regard the first sections of this paper as the irritating shoulder-darts, and to deal with them a little summarily by shaking out the loosely fastened ones and rubbing off others against the walls of our arena.

For instance, it appears to me that we begin with a disclaimer so sweeping as practically to invalidate the whole paper in its special application. If nothing exceptional is to be expected from historians why take such pains to damn them? It is true that the author has anticipated this criticism by some rather subtle dialectic of differentiation, but I submit that the paper itself, in its matter and its manner, very thoroughly eclipses the ingenious exceptions. No doubt it had to in order to be worth its salt, but the point should not pass unnoticed.

It does seem necessary, moreover, as a tolerably humble member of a guild of characteristically modest scholars, to refuse to accept Professor Fieldhouse's persistent caricature of the historians, as historians, or as historians-turned-citizens. No doubt we share with all men the inability to see ourselves as others see us, and I may be merely exceptionally deficient in this regard, but my mature impression is that most historians whom I know recognize differences, are tolerant, and emphasize continuity. Moreover, these qualities in them seem to make them an exceptionally self-critical group of men, so much so that the reproach which they most often level at themselves is that too much history has infected them with the virus of fatalistic resignation to impotence. This is far from the arrogance which Professor Fieldhouse implies that they reveal. Perhaps the answer is, either that Professor Fieldhouse really objects only to his old enemies, the Whig historians, or that he is attacking vulgarizers, journalists, and text-book writers. In either case, he should have said so.

In fact, Professor Fieldhouse comes quite close to arrogance himself. His attitude toward students as bottles in a machine which carries them to the teacher-spout to be filled and capped is an unwarranted and probably dangerous one. Then again, in speaking of himself and other historians, there is too much insistence that "we select" historical happenings for emphasis. It would be humbler and wiser, and it would iron out some of the apparent or real contradictions in his paper, if he admitted that for the most part we historians do not select events, but that they impose themselves on us. A historian who attempts any substantial piece of synthesis is like a base-ball or cricket player. The playing-field has been marked out for him and there are a good many arbitrary ground-rules imposed upon him as well.

Further, I very much doubt whether Bolingbroke meant, by



"genius," "the innate ability to profit by experience." I prefer to accept the definition given in the eighteenth century by Helvétius and by his ardent young disciple Jeremy Bentham, that is, the capacity for invention. This meaning seems particularly important because the interpretation given to the word must be closely interlocked with Professor Fieldhouse's evaluation of tradition in explaining the course of history.

The bull's great problem at this stage of the sacrificial ceremony is that his tormentor is so agile. I must admit to feeling that Professor Fieldhouse changes his ground so often, so rapidly, and, behind his cunning cape, so mysteriously, that even when I feel I have him cornered on ground for dispute, he often leaps beyond my reach over the wooden barrier.

Try, for instance, to pin Professor Fieldhouse down on democracy. One can profitably accept a great number of his differentiations between the Continental and the British meanings given to the word, but why, in the name of all the virtues which he selects as historical, try to maintain that modern British democracy is even in major part "democracy according to Selden and Locke"? The ancient strain is there, of course; we even write books and articles about its persistence, but we have to peer behind whole generations of such things as universal suffrage, state social services, political trade-unionism, and deep-cutting capital levies in the forms of taxation, in order to detect it. The old strain of Rousseau is present on the Continent today too, but again behind sturdy walls of authoritarian bureaucracy, administrative law, military conscription, the police state, and praetorian politics. A far safer approach would be to stress the differences between states with land frontiers and a state which has still, to a reassuring degree, the advantage of occupying one whole island.

Much the same remarks would apply to his comments on liberalism and on its religious affiliations. English Nonconformity is at least as anti-clerical *vis-à-vis* the Anglican Church as French liberalism is *vis-à-vis* the Church of Rome, and so forth. I suggest, therefore, that it is thoroughly unprofitable to pursue the *matador* through his mazy manœuvres in quest of principles for international understanding. If we want to discuss international relations, let us do so in terms of power, whether conditioned by geography, population, resources, or human organization; or in terms of surrender of power, either to a master or to an international organization; for, after all, power is the business of politics.

A good deal of the comment on domestic politics in France seems basically to be the assertion that on the Continent as in England an old principle rhymed by Sir William Schwenck Gilbert and harmonized by Sir Arthur Seymour Sullivan has in general held true, namely:

That ev'ry boy and ev'ry gal  
That's born into the world alive  
Is either a little Liberal  
Or else a little Conservative.

One can point out in this connection that most English-speaking historians are by inclination close students of Gilbert and Sullivan, and as textual experts are sure to have noted that Sir William used the term "world." Some of them may even have read the only really con-

vincing universal history ever written. I refer, of course, to Anatole France's *Penguin Island*.

A good many of my disagreements with Mr. Fieldhouse's comments on British policy after 1919, particularly when he sets that policy against a background of two centuries, could be summed up in a consideration which he completely neglects. This is that, from 1713 to 1900, it is roughly true to say that Great Britain's natural and acquired advantages made her the most powerful political entity in the world, but that by 1918 that was no longer true. You have to be recognized as very powerful in your own right before a lot of other Powers will let you balance them to your advantage. After 1919 the English-speaking world amply and continuously discussed this alteration in the world situation and, unless I am mistaken, American, British, and Canadian historians were conspicuous in their realization that because the League of Nations was not globally comprehensive, it was imperative to continue to examine world politics in terms of balanced powers, whether you included the League or not. In other words, there was no such momentous revolution as Professor Fieldhouse suggests, except in the sense of a decline in relative British power which seems not to have figured in his thinking.

On the other hand, if Professor Fieldhouse will lower his sword, I shall agree with him about North American self-righteousness after 1919. We all inveighed against it and perhaps if we had really "turned-citizens" we might have done something about it. I also agree, in part at least, with his remarks about economic determinists, but do we not all struggle with ourselves every day of our teaching and writing lives in the effort to cope judiciously with problems of economic interpretation of history? I do not believe that any large percentage of us has surrendered completely to determinism.

If I were forced to choose the ground for a last stand, it would be that Professor Fieldhouse's basic position is weakened by his strong inclination to emphasize tradition and to close his eyes to change. He proves to be, after all, still the eighteenth-century Tory, still trying to expose those damned Whigs. I could focus my uneasiness about all this by pointing out his complete oblivion to the growth of what is now the United States since 1714. If you add the ominous rise of Japan, and the rapid industrialization of the whole world, with all that that implies in terms of dependence on strategic raw materials, none of which phenomena figures in Professor Fieldhouse's conspectus, you are confronted with historical circumstances which are at least as important as alterations in the European balance of power. It seems particularly regrettable to neglect them completely in addressing a Canadian audience, for if the United Nations lose this war Canadians are not likely to be spared the attentions of the victors to their nickel and other natural resources, and if the United Nations win it, Canada will have as her only neighbour a Power which will be so strong that Canadians would be most unwise to expect it to behave with all that respect and imagination which they have been accustomed to believe is their due.

Mr. New said that he had been very greatly impressed by Mr. Fieldhouse's introductory statement, in which the speaker had indicated the task of the historian. He was not so sure that he agreed with the illustrations. He took issue with the manner in which the term "democracy" was used in the paper.



In regard to the attitude of the historian towards contemporary forces, Mr. New said that it was not adequate merely to signalize these forces, but that the historian must take sides, condemning what he thought worthy of condemnation and approving what he found worthy of approval. This raises the question of objectivity and subjectivity. In our teaching we all reveal our enthusiasms and convictions, but in public we too often try to suppress these subjective influences.

Mr. New said that the influence of the materialist interpretation of history had greatly declined during the past ten years, and he thought the historian should be helping to make this clear to the public. With the main point of the paper—that we, whose training enjoins tolerance, allows us to perceive differences, and creates a sense of continuity, have used these qualities less than we should—he was in complete agreement.

*Mr. Underhill* contended that the speakers had avoided discussing Mr. Fieldhouse's paper. If bull-fights are as innocuous as Mr. Brebner's remarks suggest, he would prefer to attend wrestling matches. Mr. Fieldhouse was really talking, not so much about the seventeenth century, as about the last twenty years. His real objection to the Whig historians is not that they are historians, but that they are liberals; he does not believe in the liberal philosophy. Canadian historians have been liberal in the worst sense of the word: they have seen English-speaking civilization as the exclusive bearer of the liberal virtues.

*Mr. Rothney* said that he wished to emphasize certain things in Mr. Fieldhouse's paper. We should not expect everyone either in Europe or America to express his ideas on politics in the same way. Historical experience is important in the formulation of these ideas. This principle is of special importance in Canada, because the French Canadians have not shared the historical experience which gave rise to our liberal political system.

*Mr. Long* said that Mr. Fieldhouse's paper partook of the essence of liberalism: it emphasized the sense of difference between earlier times and the present day. There are pertinent examples of the need of this sense in Canadian as well as in English and European history. In Canada the general approach to the struggle for responsible government and Dominion autonomy is from the point of view of present conditions. People are inclined to believe that British opposition to demands for self-government was prompted merely by reactionary desire to cling to power. They fail to see that British resistance must be judged in the light of conditions of the time, when the colonies were immature. Thus a prejudice against Great Britain is created. Canadian historians have not entirely freed themselves from this misconception.

*Mr. Flenley* agreed that the real problem is that set forth in Mr. Fieldhouse's paper. But the speaker himself has judged the downfall of France in 1940 on the basis of deep-laid prepossessions. No historian is without them, and he cannot possibly avoid being influenced by them. Of course, this does not mean that we all say the same things, but here is the dilemma: how can we possibly stand aside from our attitude towards the events we are recording?

*Mr. Kenney* thought that Canada ought to be rather proud of its historians. They have strengthened our efforts in the present world fight against reaction, without ceasing to be historians. Parkman, Lea, and Gibbon, who once were held up as shining examples of the historian who went down into the market-place, produced great polemics, great political pamphlets. The Canadian historians have not done this, and we can be grateful.

*Mr. Saunders* said that he thought the speaker had started by deploing what the historians had done, and ended by giving them an inadequate task. He seemed to be recalling us to the scientific view of history although we are all agreed that this is impossible. We should admit that we must have convictions, that we should find some ideals in history that we prefer to others, and express these preferences. Historians are disregarded by the public because they leave people to make their own judgments, refusing to give the leadership that is asked of them.

*Mr. Gelber* said that the central contradiction in *Mr. Fieldhouse's* paper was between the concept of history for its own sake, and the concept of history to illuminate modern events. A study of some remote period, though good as a training in method, does not fit historians to judge present affairs. The historian must himself reveal a quality of statesmanship: the major indictment against him is that often he does not. For example, in E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, the Munich agreement is described as the greatest example of peaceful change in modern times. *Mr. Gelber* gave other examples of the failure of historians to indicate the real significance of the events they are narrating.

*Mr. Brown* said that some distinction must be made between the subjects on which an historian should give judgment and those on which he should not. For example, he did not regard the parliamentary system as applicable in all countries, but he did think that its development in the English-speaking world was of great importance and he did not propose to surrender his right to say so. That does not mean, however, that the historian need associate himself with any contemporary movement for the reform of the parliamentary system: that is the province of the statesman.

In reply, *Mr. Fieldhouse* said that he regretted that *Mr. Brebner* seemed to minimize the difference between what he (*Mr. Fieldhouse*) had called democracy according to Selden and Locke, and democracy according to Rousseau. Surely there was a very real difference between mass plebiscitary-democracy and classical representative democracy? English "liberties" had originally been civil and personal rather than political—freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of speech and association, etc.; and nineteenth-century democracy had taken that basis for granted. The totalitarian states, however, had shown us what could happen when popular tyrants used the apparatus of mass democracy—plebiscites, popular assemblies etc.—to destroy all the old liberal guarantees of *personal* freedom. We had been witnessing a steady progression from Whig limited democracy, through parliamentary mass-democracy (the stage now reached by England) to plebiscitary mass-democracy and its other aspect, Caesarean mass-dictatorship.

He was also sorry that *Mr. Brebner* seemed to minimize the difference between England and the Continent. We ourselves, with our economic materialism, tended to associate the Right with the defence of property and privilege, and the Left with the attack on these things. But, in Latin Europe, there was a philosophic Right, concerned with the defence of spiritual values as against the materialism and anti-clericalism of the Left; and for the past twenty years in France there had been what he would call, for want of a better term, a Christian-Democratic movement which was attempting to bridge this gulf and to take the democracy of the Left, purge it of its materialism, and combine it with the spiritual values of a Right pried loose from its artificial and unhistorical alliance with property and privilege.



## THE FUR-SEAL FISHERIES AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

By CHARLES C. TANSILL  
*Fordham University*

THE controversy between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fur-seal fisheries was one that involved several important principles of international law. In this brief paper there is no opportunity to develop all the questions at issue between the two nations, but attention can be directed to the ironic fact that with reference to the fur-seal fisheries dispute the United States abandoned its historic stand for the freedom of the seas, and Great Britain defended a doctrine that in practice she had at times openly flouted.

The roots of this fur-seal controversy can be traced back to 1727 when Vitus Bering, a Dane in Russian employ, discovered the strait that bears his name. Fourteen years later he explored the Aleutian Islands and sailed along the coast of Alaska.<sup>1</sup> His course was eagerly followed by Russian traders who were anxious to supply furs for the Chinese market at Kiakta. As a base from which to extend their operations, they made a settlement upon the Aleutian Islands.<sup>2</sup> But this spirited search for furs led to sharp friction between rival traders, and in order to stop this growing competition the Czar issued on July 8, 1799, a ukase which organized the Russian American Company. For a period of twenty years this company was given a monopoly of the trade along that part of the North American coast which lay above the 55th degree of north latitude. It was empowered to "make new discoveries not only north of the fifty-fifth degree of north latitude, but farther to the south, and to occupy the new lands discovered . . . if they have not been previously occupied by . . . any other nations."<sup>3</sup>

Although this grant of monopoly rights to the Russian American Company served to quiet the friction between Russian traders along the North-west Coast, it did not put an end to the visits of American vessels to points above the 55th parallel of north latitude.

In 1784 Yankee merchants opened a lucrative trade with the Chinese port of Canton, and they soon discovered that Chinese mandarins would pay high prices for good furs. In order to secure these valuable pelts, American traders sailed along the North-west Coast with scant regard for Russian restrictions. Diplomatic protests presented by the Russian Minister at Washington were politely accepted but quietly ignored.<sup>4</sup> Perhaps another ukase would remedy the situation, so on September 16, 1821, the Czar granted to certain of his subjects a monopoly over the "pursuits of commerce, whaling and fishery, and of all other industry on all the islands, posts, and gulfs including the whole of the northwest

---

<sup>1</sup>F. A. Golder, *Bering's Voyages* (2 vols., New York, 1922).

<sup>2</sup>James Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* (London, 1784), III, 359-83. For a scholarly account of the expansion of Russia, see R. J. Kerner, *The Urge to the Sea* (Berkeley, 1942). Certain aspects of the quest for furs are admirably described in Adele Ogden, *The California Sea Otter Trade, 1784-1848* (Berkeley, 1942).

<sup>3</sup>*Proceedings of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal* (Washington, 1904), II, 23-5.

<sup>4</sup>Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia* (New York, 1922), 34-43; J. C. Hildt, *Early Diplomatic Negotiations of the United States with Russia* (Baltimore, 1906), 158-9.

coast of America, beginning from Behring Straits to the 51° of northern latitude." All foreign vessels were forbidden to approach within less than one hundred Italian miles of these coasts. Several days later (September 25, 1821) a second ukase renewed the monopoly granted to the Russian American Company, and invested it with the sole right to control the fisheries "from the northern point of the Island of Vancouver, under 51° north latitude, to Behring Straits and beyond them."<sup>5</sup>

The Russian government next sent a note to Lord Castlereagh in which it was pointed out that the purpose of the imperial ukases was to stop the trading by "vagabonds" along the North-west Coast.<sup>6</sup> Although the British government knew that this Russian edict was primarily aimed at the repression of the activities of American traders, it was nevertheless thought to be expedient to register a complaint against the Russian pretension to sovereignty over the waters extending from the North-west Coast to Bering Straits.<sup>7</sup>

The American government filed a similar protest against these extravagant Russian assertions of authority, and negotiations were initiated that led to the conclusion of the treaty of April 17, 1824. Under the terms of this convention the Czar's government abandoned any claim to exclude American citizens from approaching within a hundred Italian miles of the North-west Coast, and the southern boundary of Alaska was fixed at the fateful parallel of fifty-four degrees and forty minutes of north latitude.<sup>8</sup> The following year the Russian and British governments signed a treaty (February 28, 1825) along similar lines.<sup>9</sup> The maritime pretensions so boldly announced by Russia in 1821 were now placed in the discard, and no further use was made of them until President Cleveland attempted to play a bold hand in the summer of 1886. To his dismay he soon discovered that in order to win the game of diplomacy one must have more than bad cards and empty bluff.<sup>10</sup>

On March 30, 1867, the representatives of Russia and the United States signed a treaty which ceded to the United States "all the territory and dominion" which the Czar of Russia possessed on the "continent of America and in the adjacent islands."<sup>11</sup> Three years later the Acting Secretary of the Treasury leased to the Alaska Commercial Company the right to take seals on the islands of St. Paul and St. George.<sup>12</sup> Under American auspices the fur-seal industry seemed to have a rosy future, and American officials were anxious to give it every possible protection. In March, 1872, Mr. T. G. Phelps wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury and called his attention to reports of various expeditions being fitted out in Australia and in other Pacific lands for the purpose of conducting

<sup>5</sup>*Proceedings of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal*, II, 25-8.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 95-7, Baron de Nicolay to the Marquis of Londonderry, Nov. 12, 1821.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, 104-5, Marquis of Londonderry to Count Lieven, Jan. 18, 1822.

<sup>8</sup>Hunter Miller, *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America*, III (Washington, 1922), 151-62.

<sup>9</sup>*Proceedings of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal*, II, 12-16.

<sup>10</sup>With reference to the general topic of the fur-seal fisheries, see J. B. Moore, *History and Digest of International Arbitrations* (Washington, 1898), I, 755-961; J. B. Lockey, "James Gillespie Blaine" (*American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, VIII, 128-45); A. F. Tyler, *The Foreign Policy of James G. Blaine* (Minneapolis, 1927), 302-45; J. B. Henderson, *American Diplomatic Questions* (New York, 1901), 3-62.

<sup>11</sup>W. M. Malloy, *Treaties, Conventions, etc.*, II, 1521-4.

<sup>12</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration, Senate Ex. Doc.*, no. 177, 53 Cong., 2 sess. (Washington, 1895, 16 vols.), IV, 80.



sealing operations in the North Pacific. In view of the damage these sealers might inflict upon a valuable American industry, was it not possible, through the employment of revenue cutters, to take some action against them?<sup>13</sup> In his reply Mr. Boutwell frankly stated that he did not see how the United States "would have the jurisdiction or power to drive off parties up there for that purpose unless they made such attempts within a marine league of the shore."<sup>14</sup>

Nine years later the Treasury Department took a much stronger stand. In March, 1881, Mr. H. F. French, Acting Secretary of the Treasury, informed Mr. D. A. d'Ancona, of San Francisco, that the treaty with Russia contained definite maritime boundaries which included a large part of Bering Sea and the North Pacific.<sup>15</sup> The penalties prescribed by American law against the killing of fur-bearing animals would attach, therefore, against any violation within these limits.

But despite this bold assertion of jurisdiction over the waters of the North Pacific, the Treasury Department did not attempt to protect the sealing industry by seizing the ships of other nations found cruising in this area. It was not until the first Cleveland Administration that any action was taken in this regard, and in this case the Treasury Department did not bother to consult with the Department of State before sending instructions to the officers in charge of the revenue cutters. Daniel Manning, the Secretary of the Treasury, had left the post of President of the National Commercial Bank of Albany, New York, to assume the burden of chief fiscal officer of the United States, and his mind seemed to be more fixed upon questions of revenue than upon diplomatic difficulties that might arise from seizures of foreign shipping. The sealing industry brought certain revenues into the Treasury Department, and Mr. Manning would conserve this income even at the cost of serious friction with Great Britain. Pelagic sealing by British schooners must cease at once, and in August, 1886, American revenue cutters began to seize ships conducting sealing operations in the North Pacific.

As soon as Lord Lansdowne heard of these seizures, he wrote to Sir John Macdonald and expressed the opinion that this action by American officials was "far more open to criticism than anything we have done."<sup>16</sup> The British Foreign Office was deeply concerned over this situation. Canadian vessels had been seized when they were more than sixty miles from the nearest land, and such action was in open defiance of the principles of international law. Lengthy instructions were sent to the British Minister at Washington, directing him to protest against these infractions of the law of nations.<sup>17</sup> Attention was called to the fact that the American government had always made it a point to proclaim in loud tones its adherence to the doctrine of the freedom of the seas. Was it about to reject one of the most important articles in the faith of the American founding fathers?

At Washington Sir Lionel West made careful preparations for his diplomatic duel with Secretary Bayard. He was a man who had walked

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 82, T. G. Phelps to Secretary Boutwell, March 25, 1872.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 83, Secretary Boutwell to T. G. Phelps, April 19, 1872.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 85-6, H. F. French to Mr. D. A. d'Ancona, March 12, 1881.

<sup>16</sup>Public Archives of Canada, Macdonald Papers, XIII, 535-41, Lansdowne to Sir John Macdonald, Sept. 20, 1886.

<sup>17</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration*, II, 153-5, Earl of Iddesleigh to Sir Lionel West, Oct. 30, 1886.

through life on the easy levels of instinct, and his amazing amours had so sapped his strength that Bayard called him a "mere postage stamp." In the summer of 1886 he made daily calls at the Department of State. He was the ideal ambulatory ambassador, and he gives real point to Hugh Gibson's famous remark that "diplomacy is not hard on the brain, but it is hell on the feet." Clad in the armour of a righteous cause, Sir Lionel strongly pressed the claims of Great Britain. Bayard was disturbed by the situation in Bering Sea, and he informed Sir Lionel that he was studying the precedents in the case. Previous to the treaty of March 30, 1867, Russia had always contended that Bering Sea was a *mare clausum* or closed sea. At this point Sir Lionel adverted to the fact that the American government had protested against such a contention. "Yes," replied Bayard, "at that time."<sup>18</sup>

But despite this Delphic utterance on the part of the Secretary of State, Sir Lionel had high hopes for an early adjustment of difficulties. During a conference with Bayard on November 19 he canvassed the whole situation, and drew from the Secretary the assurance that the American government would look into the matter in a "spirit of fairness."<sup>19</sup> This was certainly true as far as Bayard was concerned, but President Cleveland knew little about international law and often had his eye fixed upon political considerations. With him it is true that public office was a public trust, but he never lost sight of the fact that the votes of the public were vitally necessary to secure the office.

Before taking up this matter of the Bering Sea seizures with President Cleveland, Bayard first turned to the American Minister at St. Petersburg and inquired if the Russian government had ever assumed control over Bering Sea.<sup>20</sup> After making extended inquiries, Mr. Lothrop informed Bayard that he could not discover any "case of seizure and adjudication under the Ukase of 1821."<sup>21</sup>

Bayard next requested the advice of the Solicitor of the Department of State. Francis Wharton was thoroughly familiar with the theory and practice of international law, and he did not hesitate to express the opinion that the American government had no right to "seize and search British vessels on the high seas of the Northwest Pacific." The Attorney-General should be promptly advised to direct a discontinuance of legal proceedings against the Canadian vessels that had been seized.<sup>22</sup>

After receiving these memoranda, and after making a careful study of every aspect of the Bering Sea situation, Bayard wrote a long letter to President Cleveland. After discussing the historic American attitude towards the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, Bayard warmly urged the President to discontinue all proceedings against the Canadian sealing vessels. The American government is "one of law," and it yields the "same voluntary and self-imposed submission to the rules of public international regulation in the use and navigation of the high seas which it requires from other members of the family of nations." In conclusion he expressed the firm conviction that the "honor" of the American

---

<sup>18</sup>*Canada, Sessional Papers*, 1887, no. 48, 32-4, Sir Lionel West to the Earl of Iddesleigh, Nov. 12, 14, 1886.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 40, Sir Lionel West to the Earl of Iddesleigh, Dec. 10, 1886.

<sup>20</sup>Bayard MS., Bayard Letter Book, III, Secretary Bayard to George V. N. Lothrop, Oct. 29, 1886.

<sup>21</sup>Bayard MS., Mr. Lothrop to Secretary Bayard, Dec. 3, 1886.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, Mr. Wharton to Secretary Bayard, Jan. 11, 1887.



government required that the Attorney-General be directed to take immediate action for the discharge of the vessels held in Alaskan ports.<sup>23</sup>

Under the impact of this strong letter the President authorized Bayard to convey to the British Minister assurances that the pending proceedings against Canadian vessels would be discontinued, but he would make no further concessions, and no assurances were given that further seizures would not be made.<sup>24</sup>

In a new effort to convince the Chief Executive that seizures of Canadian sealing vessels on the high seas constituted a palpable infraction of international law and were in violation of the American theory and practice, Bayard prepared a memorandum which he sent to the White House. He was certain that Bering Sea was not a closed sea but was a "part of the high seas of the world, and equally open to the navigation of all nations." American jurisdiction in that area did not extend "to a greater distance from the land than is claimed and exercised by the United States over the waters adjacent to its territories on the Atlantic coast."<sup>25</sup>

In his memorandum for the guidance of the President, Bayard emphasized the expediency of settling, by international arrangement, all the questions arising out of seal hunting in Bering Sea. In a personal letter to Phelps, in London, he expressed the view that it might be well to discuss with Lord Salisbury "the necessity for co-operative action of the two governments over their respective citizens, to prevent the annihilation of the fur seals. I do not see how we can maintain Behrings Sea to be a *mare clausum*, or claim an exclusive jurisdiction beyond the three mile limit."<sup>26</sup>

While Bayard was endeavouring to convince President Cleveland that American seizures of Canadian sealing vessels in Bering Sea were a serious infraction of international law, the new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fairchild, was permitting American revenue cutters to resume this practice. Bayard exerted fresh pressure upon the President, who once more directed the Attorney-General to issue an order "for the release of the officers and other persons employed in the vessels lately seized by the Revenue Cutter *Rush* in Behring Sea." It was significant, however, that this instruction to the Attorney-General was prefaced with a reservation to the effect that this order of release would have no effect upon the "other questions connected with the alleged violation of the laws of the United States relating to the fur-seal fisheries."<sup>27</sup> This meant that the Canadian *ships* were not released, and in a brief memorandum attached to the President's letter, Bayard remarked: "The reasons for this release arise from the regard for the personal liberty of the individuals. As to the detention of property, compensation can always be awarded."<sup>28</sup>

President Cleveland still clung to the belief that the United States had some measure of control over the waters of Bering Sea with special reference to the preservation of the herds of seal that were threatened

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, Secretary Bayard to President Cleveland, Jan. 22, 1887.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, Secretary Bayard to Sir Lionel West, Feb. 3, April 12, 1887.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, Memorandum prepared by Secretary Bayard for President Cleveland, April 28, 1887.

<sup>26</sup>*Bayard Letter Book*, V, Secretary Bayard to Phelps, May 6, 1887.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, President Cleveland to the Acting Attorney-General, Aug. 23, 1887.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, Memorandum written by Bayard, Aug. 1887.

with destruction by pelagic killing. After a conference with the Chief Executive and the Acting Attorney-General, Bayard noted in a memorandum that the "President seemed disposed to delay giving any order that would indicate the restriction of our jurisdiction *to three miles*."<sup>29</sup>

The President's reluctance to take any decisive stand in this matter of jurisdiction in Bering Sea had many implications, and the *New York Times* remarked that the Cleveland Administration was still disposed to treat the North Pacific as a "closed sea."<sup>30</sup> This comment was correct with reference to the President's position, but it did not do justice to Bayard's position. In a personal letter to an old friend, Bayard frankly stated that he would not make any claim that was untenable. He believed that any assertion of jurisdiction over the waters of Bering Sea was in direct conflict with the traditional American support of the doctrine of the freedom of the seas. With special reference to the role played by the Alaska Commercial Company, he was determined "not to allow the interests of any association of Commercial or trading interests to lead us into a position not based upon law, justice and consequent National dignity and self-respect."<sup>31</sup>

But Bayard soon realized that the Acting Attorney-General was firmly of the opinion that the United States had jurisdiction over vast stretches of Bering Sea. The three-mile limit was scornfully rejected by this lawyer who would not permit his far-ranging vision to be cramped by accepted legal limitations. In a long letter to Bayard, he discussed with legal loquacity the many points involved in the question of preserving the fur seals in Bering Sea. After a show of learning he came to the conclusion that the "United States, as sovereign, has the right to protect the fur seals whose habitat is upon the shores and islands of Alaska, whether within or without the marine belt."<sup>32</sup>

After receiving this jolt from the Department of Justice, Bayard next felt the impact of a learned memorandum from Francis Wharton, the Solicitor of the Department of State. In his earlier memoranda Wharton had insisted that the American government could not claim any jurisdiction in Bering Sea outside the three-mile limit. Now, possibly taking his cue from the President or from Mr. Jenks, Wharton suddenly abandoned his former ground and moved to the position that the "three-mile zone" is not "an arbitrary cosmopolitan rule, but a rule adopted by compromise and custom for certain specific coasts." Applying this idea to the situation in Bering Sea, Wharton expressed the conviction that "wherever a sovereign has property, there he is to have sufficient police control over the waters adjacent to such property as to enable him to protect it. This is the rule of the law of nations. . . . The three-mile rule has never applied to the North Pacific."<sup>33</sup>

While Bayard was trying to digest this legal advice that looked towards the adoption of a policy that was certain to lead to increasing difficulties with England, Phelps, in London, was sounding a note that was distinctly belligerent. Unlike other American representatives at the Court of St. James, Phelps was never converted into an Anglophile

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, Memorandum written by Bayard, Aug. 25, 1887.

<sup>30</sup>*New York Times*, Aug. 22, 1887.

<sup>31</sup>Bayard MS., Bayard to Thomas Wright, Aug. 27, 1887.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, Acting Attorney-General (George A. Jenks) to Secretary Bayard, Aug. 31, 1887.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, Francis Wharton to Secretary Bayard, Sept. 4, 1887.



with deep sympathies for the English point of view. He retained his Yankee suspicions of things British, and was sharply critical of the failure of the British Foreign Office to court American favour by turning a cold shoulder to Canadian demands. In a personal letter to Bayard, Phelps complained of British weakness wherever Canada was concerned. Lord Salisbury had assured him that he had done "what he could to induce moderation in the conduct of the Canadians, but again intimated that the Imperial Government stands much in the situation of a *broker*." This being the case, Bayard should hold on to the Canadian vessels that had been seized in Bering Sea. Such action might induce the Foreign Office to be more conciliatory.<sup>34</sup>

Ill feeling concerning the Bering Sea seizures was fast rising both in the United States and in Canada, and the American Consul at Halifax reported that one of the newspapers in that city had become "very abusive towards the United States," and had demanded that the "outrages be stopped."<sup>35</sup> In response to these complaints, Sir Lionel West called at the Department of State and presented a long instruction he had received from Lord Salisbury. There was nothing new in this communication. The familiar arguments concerning British rights in the North Pacific were rehearsed, and the principles of international law were again discussed. It was a routine instruction that failed to point to any mode of prompt settlement of the controversy.<sup>36</sup>

Bayard had already realized that nothing could be accomplished by a continuous exchange of diplomatic notes. The Bering Sea question could be settled only through international co-operation. On August 19 Bayard sent a circular instruction to the American Ministers accredited to France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Norway, Russia, and Sweden, directing them to lay before the Foreign Offices of these different countries the matter of preserving fur-seal life in Bering Sea through regulations prescribed in a multi-lateral treaty.<sup>37</sup>

The French, Japanese, and Russian governments were quick to respond to this invitation, but Lord Salisbury delayed taking any action. Finally, in February, 1888, Phelps reported that the British Foreign Office had expressed its willingness to "join the United States Government in any preventive measures it may be thought best to adopt" with reference to the preservation of the herds of seal in the North Pacific.<sup>38</sup> Bayard was delighted with this co-operative spirit, and he wrote to Phelps that he would suggest that instructions be given to the officers in charge of American revenue cutters not to "molest British vessels at a distance from the shore in Behring's Sea."<sup>39</sup> As an additional precaution against friction in the North Pacific, Bayard instructed Phelps to ask Lord Salisbury about the possibility of refusing clearances to Canadian vessels intending to conduct sealing operations during the approaching summer.

When this matter was laid before Lord Lansdowne he expressed doubts about the power to refuse these clearances. He thought it was

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, Aug. 27, 1887.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, Mr. Phelan to Secretary Bayard, Sept. 8, 1887.

<sup>36</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration*, II, 162-5, Marquis of Salisbury to Sir Lionel West, Sept. 10, 1887.

<sup>37</sup>*Senate Ex. Doc.*, no. 106, 50 Cong., 2 sess., 84.

<sup>38</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration*, II, 175, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, Feb. 25, 1888.

<sup>39</sup>Bayard MS., Bayard Letter Book, VII, Secretary Bayard to Phelps, March 16, 1888.

quite unlikely that the Canadian government would be able "to prevent" sealers from "fishing as usual during the present season." If the American government were wise it would see to it that Canadian sealing ships were unmolested, and it would "endeavor to come to some arrangement" with Great Britain for the "establishment of a close time for the future."<sup>40</sup>

Lord Salisbury was more conciliatory than Lord Lansdowne, and instructions were sent to the Governor-General of Canada directing him to prevent the clearance, from British Columbian ports, of vessels intending to shoot seals in Bering Sea during the summer of 1888. Lord Salisbury then grew so generous as to suggest the "inclusion of everything north of north latitude 47 degrees" as the maritime area which should be under international control with reference to the preservation of seal life.<sup>41</sup> Bayard responded to these goodwill gestures by indicating his willingness to accept a close season in the North Pacific that would run only from April 15 to October 15.<sup>42</sup>

Concession was in the air and Anglo-American amity was much in evidence, but Canada soon supplied a big fly in this new ointment of friendship. After a conversation with Lord Salisbury, Henry White wrote a short letter to Secretary Bayard in which he expressed certain forebodings of trouble. He was certain that in Canada there was a real fear that the American government was "trying to 'do' them out of something. I have seen Lord Salisbury twice in society since writing to you on the 28th, and he implied that Canada is the source of delay. . . . Lord Salisbury inquired whether I had any instructions as to the *duration* of the proposed Seal Convention. Evidently the Canadians are anxious to cut it as short as possible. I said 'as long a time as possible,' but no special time had been mentioned in your instructions. He thought (I fancy, inspired by Canada) about three or five years."<sup>43</sup> There is little doubt that the necessity of consulting Canadian desires was the main reason for British delay in coming to an agreement with the United States with reference to the protection of seal life in the North Pacific. In seeking to conclude an arrangement concerning the close season, Lord Knutsford proposed that this season should operate with reference only to pelagic sealing. This proposal did not please Lord Lansdowne, who wished to have American sealers on the islands in Bering Sea placed under the same restrictions as the sealers on the high seas. But Lord Knutsford apprehended difficulties in securing this concession from the United States, and he expressed his fears that if the present situation continued there was grave danger of "serious friction."<sup>44</sup>

In order to prevent this friction, Bayard prepared for President Cleveland a draft of amended regulations that would not bear so hard upon Canadian sealing vessels in Bering Sea.<sup>45</sup> But this conciliatory course encountered many obstacles, and one of them was the reluctant attitude of British Columbian officials to respond to pressure from the

<sup>40</sup>Macdonald Papers, Governor-General's Correspondence, XV, 127, Lansdowne to Sir John Macdonald, April 7, 1888.

<sup>41</sup>Bayard MS., Henry White to Secretary Bayard, April 18, 1888.

<sup>42</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration*, II, 180, Secretary Bayard to Henry White, May 1, 1888.

<sup>43</sup>Bayard MS., Henry White to Secretary Bayard, May 2, 1888.

<sup>44</sup>Governor-General's Correspondence, XV, 177-8, Lord Knutsford to Lord Lansdowne, May 9, 1888.

<sup>45</sup>Bayard MS., Secretary Bayard to President Cleveland, May 9, 1888.



Foreign Office in the matter of refusing clearances for vessels engaged in sealing. To Bayard this attitude seemed unpardonable, and he thought it was difficult to see "why Great Britain should permit one of her colonies to thwart a plan intended to preserve the race of seals from extermination."<sup>46</sup>

He was soon to discover that Lord Salisbury was extremely anxious to cater to Canadian desires. From Henry White news came that the Foreign Office would take no further steps to conclude a convention concerning seals until the wishes of the Canadian government had been ascertained in detail. London was paying more and more heed to Ottawa.<sup>47</sup>

In June Phelps reported that Lord Salisbury was still awaiting some action on the part of Canada, and it was understood that he was growing "impatient" at the delay caused by Canadian tactics.<sup>48</sup> But this impatience did not seem seriously to worry the Canadian government, and negotiations continued their leisurely course. On July 13 Phelps informed Bayard that no progress had been made in the matter of the "seal fishery convention owing solely to the opposition of Canada. England and Russia agree with us. I shall continue to press it, and unless soon disposed of, shall recommend a course in which Russia will join, and to which England will not, I am sure, take much exception—the seizure of all vessels found engaged in the exterminating cruelty which it is sought to put an end to. I do not doubt that such a course may be supported."<sup>49</sup> In London Phelps began to chafe more and more under British reluctance to exert pressure upon Canada, and he became convinced that the situation called for firm action on the part of the United States. America "must show Canada that she cannot outrage us with impunity. And the moment we take a firm stand all the trouble will cease. That is the surest way to avoid difficulty. And you may be sure it will be satisfactory to the present British Government which is embarrassed by Canadian conduct which she can not control and can not justify, and can not afford to fight for."<sup>50</sup>

This belligerent advice was given to Bayard in a personal letter from Phelps in the second week of September, 1888. In an official despatch of the same date he writes in the same aggressive spirit. There were only two alternatives for the American government to take. One was meek submission to Canadian practices in the North Pacific, and the other was seizure of Canadian sealing vessels. Between these two alternatives there should not be the slightest hesitation on the part of the American government. The three-mile limit had been invoked by the British government as a prohibition against the seizure of Canadian vessels on the high seas, but this limit had no universal application in international law. It should also be remembered that international law is not a collection of dusty precedents that statesmen keep in national archives against the time when they may be used to advantage. International law is something that is constantly expanding and taking on new aspects: it had "arisen from precedents that have been established

---

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*, Memorandum written by Bayard, May 17, 1888.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, Henry White to Secretary Bayard, May 17, 1888.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, June 23, 1888.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, July 13, 1888.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, Sept. 12, 1888.

when the just occasion for them arose, undeterred by the discussion of abstract and inadequate rules."<sup>51</sup>

Phelps was eager for a show of force, but Bayard would not adopt such a belligerent course of action. He was familiar with the fact that one nation cannot make international law no matter how pressing the exigency. He continued to adhere to the position that the best way to settle the seal-fisheries dispute was through an "international arrangement which would enable the nations to co-operate for the purpose of preventing the destruction of the seal."<sup>52</sup> This international arrangement must have a background of friendly understanding rather than a prelude of sharp friction that might lead to war.

Although Bayard constantly clung to this policy of conciliation, there were some officials in the Cleveland Administration who thought that the best way to bring the British government to reason was through the adoption of a policy of defiance. In Congress this was a common viewpoint, and on February 18, 1889, Mr. Dunn, Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, reported back from his committee a bill (H.R. 12432) to provide for the better protection of the fur-seal and salmon fisheries of Alaska. One paragraph in this bill amended section 1956 of the *Revised Statutes of the United States* so that its terms included "all the waters of Behring Sea" that were embraced within the boundaries as described in the treaty of March 30, 1867. The President was empowered to issue a proclamation warning all persons against entering these waters for the purpose of violating the provisions of this section.<sup>53</sup>

In his speech in support of this bill, Mr. Dunn frankly stated that his purpose was more adequately to protect seal life in the North Pacific. Russia had exercised jurisdiction over Bering Sea, and the United States should do the same.<sup>54</sup> Other members of Congress were equally forthright in expressing their opinions about the necessity for extending American control over the waters of Bering Sea, and it was apparent that they had little concern about the consequences.<sup>55</sup>

This belligerence on the part of members of the House of Representatives was somewhat tempered by a measure of restraint exercised by the more conservative members of the Senate. At a conference between House and Senate leaders the bill dealing with the fur-seal fisheries was amended so as to make its provisions sufficiently ambiguous. Section 1956 of the *Revised Statutes* was now to apply only to "the dominion of the United States in the waters of the Behring Sea," and the President was empowered to issue a proclamation warning all persons against entering these waters for the purpose of killing fur-bearing animals. He was also given authority to send one or more vessels to cruise in these designated waters and seize all vessels engaged in operations that were in violation of section 1956.<sup>56</sup>

As one reads the provisions of this bill it is evident that the legislative decks had been cleared for action that might easily bring war. The person directly responsible for this legislation was Mr. Poindexter Dunn, Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

<sup>51</sup>*Fur Seal Arbitration*, II, 181-3, Phelps to Secretary Bayard, Sept. 12, 1888.

<sup>52</sup>Bayard MS., Memorandum written by Bayard after a conversation with Baron Rosen, March 1, 1889.

<sup>53</sup>*Congressional Record*, 50 Cong., 2 sess., XX, pt. 3, Feb. 18, 1889, 2021-2.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, 2022-7.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 2026.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, 2614.



in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, Mr. Dunn must have worked in close co-operation with President Cleveland, who, it should be remembered, had held out against any surrender of the claim of American jurisdiction over Bering Sea. The President knew that Secretary Bayard had been strongly opposed to this claim, and therefore he had not hesitated to work behind Bayard's back in order to push through this legislative programme. He had not hesitated to employ similar tactics in connection with the Scott Act that had made a mere scrap of paper out of our treaty with China.<sup>57</sup> Devious dealing was a part of the Cleveland procedure when it came to the conduct of foreign relations in the latter part of his Administration.

For many months Bayard had held out against presidential pressure in this matter of jurisdiction over Bering Sea. He had also been at odds with the Solicitor of the Department of State and with the Minister to Great Britain on this same point. Party leaders in Congress apparently knew of this defection, and felt free to disregard Bayard's viewpoint. In the legislative rush that came in the last days of the 50th Congress, the Department of State was neatly by-passed, and Bayard was left holding a position that the President had always wished to surrender. By this surrender Mr. Cleveland abandoned the long-cherished principle of the freedom of the seas, and gave to the British government the opportunity to stand as a leader in the fight for a free sea. Bayard was keenly aware of all the implications in the legislation sponsored by the President; he could have no doubt that he had been pushed aside in the matter of formulating American foreign policy. He could, however, console himself with the thought that he had closely adhered to the principles that had long been regarded as important articles in the American creed. Freedom of the Seas was a slogan that dated back to the American Revolution, and it had been a battle cry in the War of 1812. Successive Secretaries of State had regarded it as one of the great political labels that Americans had lived by and had died by, and they had given it wide currency. But President Cleveland was so out of touch with American tradition that he closed his ears to this old call to arms and permitted Lord Salisbury to bring it out in a new edition with appropriate English accents. It is surprising to discover that the American Chief Executive was so ignorant of American precedents; it is equally surprising to discover that many American historians still speak in glowing terms of Cleveland's "sturdy Americanism."

#### DISCUSSION

In reply to questions, *Mr. Tansill* said that he thought Cleveland's attitude was to be explained almost entirely by the fact that he was looking toward the elections of 1888. Bayard, he said, thought Tupper was a liar, and disliked Chamberlain's "Birmingham tone," but he was on the whole friendly to Canada and wanted to avoid trouble. There was continual concern and perplexity in Washington during this period because the Foreign Office failed to put pressure on Canada. In regard to the Irish bloc in Congress, Mr. Tansill said that Bayard disliked it, but that Cleveland was responsive to it.

---

<sup>57</sup>C. C. Tansill, *The Foreign Policy of Thomas F. Bayard* (New York, 1940), 175-7.

## AMERICAN CONCERN OVER CANADIAN RAILWAY COMPETITION IN THE NORTH-WEST, 1885-1890

By ROSEMARY LORNA SAVAGE  
*Columbia University*

EARLY in the 1880's the railroads reached out from the eastern seaboard and entered the north-western region of the North American continent. True, the first transcontinental railroad had spanned the United States as early as 1869, but this had followed the central route, through Missouri to California, and the north-western area remained more or less isolated, a sort of stepchild, rich in potentialities, but suffering from neglect. Then suddenly, within ten years, three transcontinental railways were built which had their terminals in the Pacific North-west. These were first, the Northern Pacific, which reached Puget Sound in 1883, second, the Canadian Pacific, which stretched across the Dominion of Canada in 1885, and the third, the Great Northern, which grew up in the territory between them, reaching completion in 1893.

Despite the political boundary of the 49th parallel cutting across the prairies, this north-western area was essentially developed as a unit. This was partly owing to the environment, the semi-arid treeless plain being totally different from anything that the European settlers had experienced before. Dry farming, and the use of windmills and drilled wells, the importation of rapidly ripening spring wheat, adapted to the short growing season, and such inventions as the steel plow and the roller milling process, all had to be brought into use before the development of this area could be successfully established. Also the early advance into the mining areas of California and British Columbia had been an international movement, with California miners taking the predominant part in the whole development.

The history of canals and railroads in the East was such that it was natural for both Canadian and American railroad interests to expect to be able to carry traffic in either country and compete for trade across the border. There is evidence to show that during the period when the affairs of the Northern Pacific were dominated by the financial house of Jay Cooke and Company, from 1869 to 1873, there was considerable interest among the directors of this railroad in projects for the annexation of the British Northwest Territories. However, by the time the Northern Pacific was completed, the possibilities that such an annexation could be brought about had been considerably diminished. The purchase of the Hudson's Bay Company's lands by the Canadian government, the completion of Confederation of the British provinces, the adherence of British Columbia to that confederation, and the fact that the Canadian Pacific was under construction, meant that the scattered British possessions were coming to possess some internal cohesion, and were no longer solely dependent for communications and transportation with the rest of the world upon their neighbour to the south.

These developments did not meet with unmitigated approval in the United States, however. There had been no particular attempt in Canada to hide the fact that the building of the Canadian Pacific had political as well as economic motives, and the whole scheme was regarded with suspicion by the anti-British elements in Washington, who looked



upon it as a scheme for enhancing British power upon the North American continent.

From these groups, therefore, there came a demand that the situation with regard to Canadian railroads should be reconsidered, with the new factors introduced by the building of the Canadian Pacific taken into consideration. The right of both countries to ship goods across the territory of the other in bond had been recognized in the Act of Congress of 1866 and the Treaty of Washington of 1871. By executive action this agreement had been extended to cover the western trade as well, without causing much comment. Those who opposed the Canadian railways wanted to rescind these privileges.

In 1889 an investigation was carried on by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate on the subject of Canadian railroads operating in the United States. The issue which precipitated this investigation was the appearance of reports in the press that the Canadian Pacific had acquired the Minneapolis, Sault Ste. Marie and Atlantic Railway, and the Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic Railway. In the words of Senator Cullom the acquisition of these "Soo" lines gave to the Canadian Pacific a monopoly over the St. Mary's Bridge which would enable it to ignore and defeat the operation of the Interstate Commerce Act in letter and in spirit.<sup>1</sup>

More fundamental changes had occurred, however, which made such an investigation necessary. One was the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act in the United States in 1887, which placed the American lines under some form of restraint in their competition with each other and with Canadian railroads. In particular they had to abide by the long-and-short haul clause which prevented them from charging less for a long journey than they did for a shorter one, and the pooling of traffic by competing railroads was forbidden. At the same time the aggressive spirit shown by the Canadian Pacific in competing for American trade was increasingly evident.

The Interstate Commerce Committee was asked to

ascertain and report to the Senate whether any railroad lines located in the United States are owned, operated or controlled by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other Canadian railroad corporation; whether commerce originating in the United States is diverted from American to Canadian lines of transportation, and if so, to what extent and by what means; . . . to inquire fully into the question of the regulation of the commerce carried on by railroad or water routes between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, and to report what legislation on the subject, if any, is necessary for the protection of the commercial interests of the United States or to promote the enforcement of the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887.<sup>2</sup>

In studying the influences which lay behind this senatorial investigation, some attention must be given to the relationships between these three north-western railroad lines. Serving the same territory as they did, inevitably they became rivals. Politically the two American lines,

---

<sup>1</sup>19 *Congressional Record*, 50 Cong., 1 sess., p. 6769 (July 25, 1888).

<sup>2</sup>*U.S. Senate Reports*, 51 Cong., 1 sess., no. 847, 1.

the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern, could be considered as uniting against their Canadian competitor. On the other hand, from a financial point of view, the Canadian Pacific and the Great Northern had closer ties in that they had both been originally built by the same group and financed by many of the same sources. In 1883, it was true, a break had come between the latter lines when James J. Hill resigned from the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific, and Stephen and Angus from the directorate of the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba, the forerunner of the Great Northern. This break was occasioned by the decision of the Canadian Pacific to build the section north of Lake Superior, which meant that the Canadian Pacific would be an independent system with its own eastern outlets, rather than a gigantic feeder for the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba. Hill gave a simple account of this decision in his testimony before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. "I sold out my interests in the Canadian Pacific. I saw a conflict was coming and I said 'We will part friends'."<sup>3</sup>

In a letter to Hill, Stephen and Angus outline their views on the future of the two lines. "Neither of us has any intention of materially reducing our holdings in the stock, so long at least as the policy of the Company is not hostile to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for which we are more immediately responsible. We are of opinion that, while the two properties are and may continue to be entirely independent of each other, both have much to gain by the maintenance of an intimate and friendly alliance." They saw no reason why the two concerns should not work in harmony. The Canadian Pacific intended to push construction to the coast. "The traffic accruing to the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba railway from that source, and from the development of the Northwest territories cannot fail to be large, and to much more than compensate your company for any loss arising from the opening of the Thunder Bay and North Superior routes," they continued. "So far as we know, the entire railway traffic between the Canadian Northwest and the United States may be secured to the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba railway for a long period, while the Canadian Pacific Railway will strive to secure as much as possible of the business which naturally seeks its channel through Canadian territory."<sup>4</sup>

However, it is interesting to note that the Senate Committee definitely suspected Hill of still being tied up with Canadian Pacific interests. At that time there seems to have been some doubt as to whether Hill really intended to build straight out to the coast or whether he would not rather make some agreement with the Canadian Pacific to give him an outlet to the coast, or even build himself through Canadian territory.

In any case the completely amicable relations suggested by Stephen and Angus do not seem to have worked out. The Canadian Pacific was not really ready to resign to American lines everything but "business naturally seeking its channel through Canadian territory." By making an agreement with the Pacific Steamship Lines it was able to compete with American transcontinental lines as far south as San Francisco. In 1888 the Canadian Pacific joined the Transcontinental Association, and received differentials on freight rates from San Francisco to points east of Chicago and also on passenger traffic to the Puget Sound area.

---

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, Testimony, 168.

<sup>4</sup>J. G. Pyle, *Life of James J. Hill* (authorized) (New York, 1916), II, 324.



Yet Van Horne definitely suspected that Hill had "exerted his influence at Washington to induce Congress to revoke the bonding privileges to Canadian railways"<sup>5</sup> and even employed an American lawyer from Detroit, Alonzo C. Raymond, to look after Canadian railroad interests in Washington.

At least three main groups can be discerned behind the agitation against Canadian railroads, which was to culminate in the Senate investigation. The first group demanded retaliatory legislation against Canada because of her treatment of American fishing vessels. Since the abrogation of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington in 1885, American rights to fish in Canadian waters were regulated by the Convention of 1818. Seizure of American fishing vessels for alleged violations of the 1818 Convention stirred up resentment in the United States, particularly in New England, where the main objective was to prevent the free entry of Canadian fish into the American market. This outcry was fanned by the Republican group which was in control of the Senate, and which took a completely partisan attitude towards the foreign policy of Cleveland and Bayard. Baulked in its effort to negotiate by Republican recalcitrance and British refusal to bring strong pressure to bear upon Canada, the Administration decided to resort to the threat of retaliatory legislation. Two bills were introduced into Congress, one by Perry Belmont in the House of Representatives and the other by Senator Edmunds of Vermont in the Senate.<sup>6</sup> The Belmont bill specifically authorized the President to forbid the entrance into the United States of Canadian merchandise and railroad rolling stock. The Edmunds bill did not mention the railroads specifically but empowered the President not only to prohibit the entrance of Canadian vessels into the United States but also to keep out fresh or salt fish or any other product of the Dominion, or goods coming from the Dominion to the United States. The Edmunds bill passed through Congress and received the presidential approval in March, 1887.

It was not brought into prominence again, however, until the refusal of the Senate to ratify the Fisheries Treaty, which was finally negotiated between the United States and Great Britain in the spring of 1888, made it necessary for the Administration to consider what further action it should take. As the terms of the rejection of the treaty made it obvious that any negotiations between the United States and Great Britain on the fisheries question were futile, it was suggested that Bayard should throw the issue squarely before the Senate by asking that the President should be empowered to carry out the retaliatory provisions of the Act of March 3, 1887. Such legislation was bound to be unpopular among the northern states, where the Canadian railways were of great importance to their prosperity, so that this suggestion placed the Senators from those states in an awkward position, particularly as congressional elections loomed ahead.

A second group can be differentiated which demanded that Canadian railroads should be kept out of the United States because of the belief that in this way Canada would be more inclined towards annexation to the United States. This philosophy was, of course, diametrically opposed

---

<sup>5</sup>Walter Vaughan, *The Life and Work of Sir William Van Horne* (New York, 1920), 233.

<sup>6</sup>House Resolution 10786, 49 Cong., 2 sess.; Senate bill 3173, 49 Cong., 2 sess.

to the commercial union movement, which was also regarded as being at least tinged with annexationism. General James H. Wilson, who seems to have been the first to make charges against the Canadian railroads before Congress, was clearly of this school of thought. In a debate with Erastus Wiman before the Board of Trade of Wilmington, Delaware, in December, 1889, Wilson made it clear that he believed strongly in the manifest destiny of the United States to extend its sway all over the American continent. "It is as immutable and as constant as the law of gravitation—No policy on our part, or on the part of the Canadians, or even on the part of a federated British Empire, can abrogate or annul this law, and yet the question of policy is an important one to this generation, for policy may hasten or delay the fulfilment of our destiny, though it cannot defeat it."<sup>7</sup> The policy which, in his estimation, should be followed by the United States would be to invite the Canadian provinces into the American union. "Should they fail to accept this generous offer they cannot regard it as at all unkind or unneighborly in us if instead of consenting to a Commercial or Customs Union, the United States at once repeal laws and abrogate the treaty under which the Transit Trade is conducted."<sup>8</sup> Among other specifications, Canadians are to give due respect to the "unimpeded operation of the law of our natural growth, with all that the law in its fullest sense can be construed to mean."<sup>9</sup> General Wilson's views were backed up by Dana in the *New York Sun*.

Echoes of Wilson's philosophy can be seen in many of the discussions which came up before the Committee. For instance, when Chauncey Depew, the President of the New York Central, was being questioned, he declared that he was in favour of commercial union because he believed that "political union follows commercial union very rapidly."<sup>10</sup> Senator Blair insisted, however, that the Canadian government had built the Canadian Pacific just because it did not want Canada to fall into the hands of the United States.

Another opponent of the Canadian railway lines who saw the menace of Canadian competition largely as a political threat was Joseph Nimmo, Junior, for many years the Chief Statistician of the Treasury Department. Nimmo waged a long and intensive campaign against the Canadian railroads. He warned the American people that the Canadian government had been transformed from a political organization into an aggressive transportation system. This was the guise which they must expect it to assume in any negotiations with the American people. "The Canadian aggression upon American interests is therefore a natural expression of the character of their government."<sup>11</sup> The United States is forced to consider "whether the United States or the British Empire is to hold the commercial supremacy on this continent."<sup>12</sup>

Nimmo believed that the American government had made a great mistake in extending the transit privileges of the Act of 1866 and the

---

<sup>7</sup>*Remarks of General James H. Wilson, in Joint Debate with Erastus Wiman, Esquire, before the Board of Trade and Citizens of Wilmington, Del, on "Our relations with Canada,"* Dec. 13, 1889, 13.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>10</sup>*Senate Report*, no. 847, 51 Cong., 1 sess., Testimony, 82.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 652.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 654.



Treaty of Washington to the ports of the Pacific coast. The Treaty of Washington had been made fifteen years before the completion of the Canadian Pacific, he argued, and the growth of the transcontinental railroads had entirely changed the situation. None of the reciprocal advantages which existed in the East applied to the western transit trade. The absence of interjecting territory made such an arrangement unnecessary to secure the shortest route. Nor were there any natural advantages of water transportation on the Canadian side in the West. Victoria had no disability, like Quebec, of her ports being ice-bound all winter. The eastern transit trade tended to bring trade to American sea-ports, while the Canadian Pacific Railway with its British steamer line adjuncts, operated very strongly to turn American commerce from American seaports. This fact created great alarm on the Pacific coast and led the convention of commercial and industrial organizations of the section to appeal to Congress for protection against the aggressions of the Canadian and British governments.<sup>13</sup> Nimmo's final indictment of the C.P.R., however, sprang from his suspicions of the political objectives which he believed it hoped to secure. In particular, the subsidized steamer lines to Asia threatened to ruin American steamer lines and to divert traffic to Canadian ports. In general he believed the plan for subsidized steamers to be part of a general scheme of "imperial confederation," and he dwelt darkly on the close identification of the Canadian Pacific with certain military objectives, particularly the formidable fortress and naval station at Esquimalt.

The third broad group which can be distinguished in the agitation against the Canadian railroads consisted of those railroad interests which dragged in the question of Canadian competition as an excuse for abandoning the unpopular long-and-short haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for securing the legalization of pooling. Raymond clearly thought that this was an important motive as far as the railroad magnates were concerned. "Concealed behind all the specious arguments of the American railway interests, lies, in my opinion, a pre-concerted determination to have Congress legalize pooling, and leave the reasonableness of rates to the interstate commerce commission to determine. Should this be accomplished the regulative influence of Canadian lines in making rates reasonable would cease to be of value."<sup>14</sup> Josiah White, a member of the New York Chamber of Commerce, summed this up when he said, "I do not think the complainants have proven their case, or that the remedies sought should be applied."<sup>15</sup> The railroad magnates were "utilizing the question now under consideration for a reason why the anti-pooling section and the long-and-short haul clause should be repealed."<sup>16</sup>

An interesting altercation developed between Senator Hiscock and A. C. Raymond as to the forces behind the investigation. Hiscock asserted that Raymond was "fighting phantoms" and that there was no disposition on the part of the American lines to try and cut off Canadian roads. He held that there was not the slightest railroad influence at the bottom of the investigation, which was simply prompted by a desire to perfect the interstate commerce legislation in regard to this aspect of the situation.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 659.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 302.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 303.

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, 566.

Canadian as well as American railroad interests made their appearance before this Senate Committee. When Van Horne came before the Committee he tried to disabuse the minds of the American legislators of some of the objections to the Canadian Pacific which they were harbouring. In the first place, he tossed aside the argument that the Canadian Pacific was other than a profit-making organization. The main interest of the shareholders and directors of the Canadian Pacific was "to make the most money they can out of the Canadian Pacific Railway for their shareholders. They are not moved by sentiment or political considerations very much."<sup>18</sup> Following this line of argument, he pointed out that the subsidies given to the Canadian Pacific were actually less, in proportion to what they had to do, than those granted to the Northern Pacific and the Union Pacific and Central Pacific. "The idea seems abroad," he went on to say, "and has been thoroughly circulated in the newspapers on this side of the line, that the Canadian Pacific is a sort of pampered pet of the Dominion Government, and that it is in receipt of favors every day. The Canadian Pacific Company gets no assistance from the Dominion government except to the extent of the ordinary compensation for carrying the mails just as the roads do here in this country, except that we do not get so much."<sup>19</sup> As for the subsidies to Pacific steamships given to the Canadian Pacific Company, "they have no relation whatever to any competition with United States lines, and there is no thought of such a thing in Canada. The relations between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Dominion government are no closer than those between the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Government at Washington—not so close really. In fact, there has been a coolness between the Canadian Pacific Company and the Dominion Government for a number of years back."

Frequent allegations were made that the Canadian lines were increasing the proportion of American trade that they carried, and that this was the result of the giving of secret rebates. Much confusion existed as to the degree to which the Canadian lines were subject to the interstate commerce law. The Interstate Commerce Commission had realized the problem from the first, and had had no hesitation in applying the Act to Canadian lines in regard to business which in any way came within its jurisdiction. Both Joseph Hickson, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and Van Horne, strenuously denied that the Canadian lines were making any attempt to evade the operation of the Act. Nor could any actual evidence be uncovered to show that such was the case. Most of the suspicions were just about as vague as the following extract from the testimony of Mr. King, President of the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway: "Of course we can not tell how they act up there, not nearly as well as we can tell how we act ourselves; but we know this, that they have abundant opportunities for doing things contrary to law without being punished."<sup>20</sup> Charles S. Smith, President of the Chamber of Commerce of New York City, said: "I know that the Canadian railroad officials claim that they observe the provisions of the interstate commerce law. It is denied on the part of our American friends. I know personally that the Canadian lines are getting a very much larger percentage of business from the New England

---

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 246-7.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 251.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 46.



states and Chicago than they received in former years, and I think it is due to our exclusively American lines that they should have a fair investigation on that subject."<sup>21</sup>

The provisions of section 232 of the Canadian railway statute, specifically allowing discrimination between localities when it was necessary by reason of competition by water or railways to secure traffic, was cited as evidence that Canadian lines did not have to observe the long-and-short haul principle with regard to their local traffic. Van Horne's evidence on this point is instructive. He submitted as evidence a letter from George Olds, the general traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in which it was stated:

So far as States traffic is concerned, whether States to States traffic or traffic between Canada and the States, we have been governed by the interstate commerce law. We have not attempted to discriminate between individuals or localities; nor have we paid rebates or anything equivalent thereto in any shape or form; nor have we assisted our American connections in any way to evade the law.

We have been unable . . . to bring our domestic traffic strictly within the long and short haul principle; but I can safely assure you that both the letter and spirit of the interstate commerce law has been far better observed by the Canadian Pacific than by any of its competitors in the United States. The reports to the contrary originate with rival lines or interested parties and their purpose is obvious.<sup>22</sup>

Olds went on to discuss the provisions of the Canadian laws which prohibited pooling and discrimination between persons and localities, although there was no long-and-short haul clause, largely owing to the prevalence of water competition. "Our deviations from the long and short haul principle in this domestic traffic do not in the slightest degree affect our American competitors," he declared, although he admitted that the opening of the "Soo" lines might require changes in local tariffs.<sup>23</sup>

The Canadian lines could also argue that they had no more freedom than many of the American lines enjoyed in regard to their traffic located within one state. The difference in character of the local traffic enjoyed by American lines and the sparsely developed territories through which the Canadian Pacific ran was pointed out both by J. J. Hill and Alonzo C. Raymond. Hill thought that "if the Canadian roads were compelled to do business throughout the Dominion on the conditions that the Americans are compelled to do their business in America, that the Canadian roads, notwithstanding the liberal bonus, could not live."<sup>24</sup> Raymond held that the advantage was all with the American lines in regard to local traffic despite the long-and-short haul clause. The local traffic, for instance, of the New York Central was so great that the system was beyond the influence of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Pennsylvania system and the Michigan Central were in much the same position. He also pointed out that the ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Buffalo rates case had shown a determination on the part of the Commission to construe the law strictly against Canadian lines.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, 279.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 254.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, 183-4.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, 500-1.

It was suggested by Mr. Smith that the control which the Canadian Pacific had acquired over the Far Eastern trade must be the result of the giving of secret rebates.<sup>26</sup> However, further discussion of the topic disclosed that the Canadian Pacific had advantages in the fact that the goods had to be handled only once, instead of twice, as would occur on American railroads, and that this was a great saving when goods were being shipped in bulk. The factor of subsidized shipping routes was also shown to be important.

The most effective arguments against stringent or coercive legislation against the Canadian railroads, however, came from Boards of Trade and representatives of industries and commerce in the New England and Middle Western towns. Many of these were dependent upon Canadian railroads and their connections for transportation or at least dependent upon Canadian lines to provide competition with the American lines and keep rates at a low competitive level. The most sweeping statements along this line came from Erastus Wiman, who claimed that

There has been no contribution to the Western States quite so advantageous as the construction of the Canadian railways. Next to the construction of the American railways and the provisions of nature in the waterways . . . these Canadian railroads have proved the most beneficial. I think the Canadian railways have contributed more to the facilities for the handling of products going east and the merchandise going west, at rates lower than ever before dreamed of, than any other enterprises that have been inaugurated in this country. First, there is the directness of the route, and second the business has been done at rates so low that they never paid anything on the capital invested.<sup>27</sup>

Wiman believed that the continued prosperity of these roads was dependent on the retention of the bonding privilege. As far as the Canadian Pacific was concerned, if the new lines constructed from Sault Ste. Marie and Duluth were rendered valueless by the abolition of the bonding system, "not only the system of the Canadian Pacific but the whole north-western railway system that has an outlet in the direction of Duluth and hence to Boston and the New England States would be paralyzed, to the great injury of the West and the East also."<sup>28</sup> Charles C. Bowen, a Detroit business man, argued that "if the British government has subsidized railroads in Canada, and thereby brought immeasurable advantages to us, it is our duty to foster this state of affairs. If it is desirable to have in mind the acquisition of Canada peacefully, we should cultivate close commercial relations. On the other hand, it may be urged that in so doing we strengthen the hands of a foreign people. True, we do; but if we add to our own strength by this process in a ratio of five to their one, which I think is our experience in the past, it is the only true course to pursue."<sup>29</sup> This supports Raymond's view of the matter. He pointed out that the strong defence of the Canadian railroads by the Chicago Board of Trade surprised the Senate Committee, in so far as the Canadian low rates had been instrumental in building up north-western towns like Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth, to the detriment of

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, 280.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, 190.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 522.



Chicago. The "Soo" lines in particular tended to divert trade from Chicago.<sup>30</sup>

Various suggestions were made for remedying the situation. Despite the absence of any concrete evidence that the Canadian railroads were not abiding by the interstate commerce law, many of the railroad men professed that they would be satisfied if they were sure that the Canadian railroads were governed by the interstate commerce law to the same extent that they were. Most of them recognized the essential difficulty that it was impossible for an American railroad commission to lay down regulations for local traffic that took place entirely in Canada. As long as Canadian railroads valued the privilege of operating in American territory, however, the threat could always be held over them that unless they complied with American regulations, their bonding privileges would be rescinded. Such action could be taken by both sides, however, and it is significant that one of Raymond's functions in Washington was, if necessary, to remind unduly belligerent legislators that if the agitation in Washington were successful, Canada was in a position to pass retaliatory measures.<sup>31</sup> In general, it can be said that Canadian roads were anxious to comply with American regulations at least so far as their American trade was concerned, as they had a good deal to lose if they inflamed American opinion against them by arbitrary and discriminatory actions. The Committee took some cognizance of this argument in weighing the vague charges made against the Canadian railroads.

Many spoke in terms of making the Canadian railroads adopt the same legislation as the Americans had already accepted, without any opportunity to adapt it to special Canadian problems. However, those who had given most thought to the matter, were in favour of some kind of agreement with Canada according to which the railroad legislation of the two countries would be brought into line. Suggestions were also made in terms of a treaty, or diplomatic negotiations, perhaps the germ of the idea which was to lead the Senate in 1911 to send to Canada a proposed treaty for the setting up of an International Railroad Commission. No action has ever been taken on this agreement in Canada.

Perhaps J. J. Hill had some such international tribunal in mind when he said: "Those matters along our very long border will come up some day, and they will be very interesting subjects for international negotiation. There are some nice points in question. I do not know why there should be any great difficulty in settling them, but I think it would be well to have them settled."<sup>32</sup> To this the Chairman of the Committee, Senator Gorman, brusquely replied by suggesting that "as good a way as any to settle these questions would be by making Canada a part of the United States."<sup>33</sup>

The question remained, however, as to whether rigid enforcement of the Interstate Commerce Act would really do the American railroads much good—particularly the transcontinental lines, which seem to have made the most determined attacks on Canadian railroads. Senator Blair came out squarely and asked Mr. Ledyard, the President of the Central Michigan Railroad, if it were not true that it was not of the

<sup>30</sup>A. C. Raymond, *Relations between American and Canadian Railways*, Address before Traffic convention held at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Aug. 28, 1889, 10.

<sup>31</sup>Vaughan, *Life of Van Horne*, 171.

<sup>32</sup>*Senate Report*, no. 847, 51 Cong., 1 sess., Testimony, 179.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, 179.

slightest consequence to American railroad men to apply the interstate commerce law in Canada, as the law then stood, and Ledyard agreed with him. Ledyard was in favour of the American railroad commission being enabled to regulate the rates charged by Canadian railroads in the United States, the theory being that the Canadian railroads were built with public money to a large extent and were not governed by the same considerations with regard to the necessity of making profits as the American lines.<sup>34</sup> In fact, the whole discussion of the Committee tended to develop into a wide appraisal of the value of the Interstate Commerce Act, and many suggestions were made for the legalization of pooling and the repeal of the long-and-short haul clause, the allowance of special terms on exported goods, and the necessity for subsidies to American steamships to compete with the British subsidized lines.

The actual recommendations of the Committee were very mild, in comparison with the hostile tone adopted toward the Canadian railroads in the body of the report. The tone of the report had been more or less set by a whole-hearted adoption of Nimmo's extreme views about the political menace of the Canadian Pacific Railway and British imperial federation. The conclusions of the Committee were summed up in the words:

At no period in our history have the American people been called upon to consider a scheme of encroachment upon American commercial interests more injurious than the scheme by the Dominion of Canada in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the subsidizing of British steamer lines on the Pacific ocean in connection with such railway, and finally by an arrangement by the Canadian Pacific Railway company with an American steamship company by which goods are carried in bond between Port Moody and the sea-ports of Washington, Oregon, and California to and from the East on the Canadian Pacific railway, rendering certain the destruction of American steamer lines now engaged in our foreign commerce and the diversion of our Asiatic commerce from American seaports to the ports of British Columbia.<sup>35</sup>

The Committee made three recommendations, only one of which concerned the railroad problem. It read as follows: "The general proposition that Canadian railroads which compete with American railroads for traffic between different points of the United States should be subjected to the same requirements of law and of regulations in pursuance of law which apply or may hereafter apply to American railroads, is so clearly marked by principles of justice and equity that it must command the assent of every fair-minded person."<sup>36</sup> The Committee went on to mention the controversy then raging as to the wisdom of repealing the long-and-short haul clause of the Interstate Commerce Act. "Whatever conclusion the committee may reach hereafter on that question as the result of the investigation it seems, in the judgment of the committee, to be the duty of Congress to take such action as will give American railroads an even chance in competition

---

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 272.

<sup>35</sup>*Senate Report*, no. 847, 51 Cong., 1 sess., 53.

<sup>36</sup>*Ibid.*, 54.



with the roads of Canada doing business in the United States." The Committee referred again to sections 226 and 232 of the Canadian statute for the regulation of traffic. These sections were regarded as encouraging the Canadian railroads to discriminate in favour of traffic secured in the United States.

The Committee therefore recommended that either a licence system should be established applicable to Canadian railroads doing business in the United States, or that some other plan, not injurious to the general trade and commerce of the country, be adopted which would secure to American railroads an equal chance in competition with Canadian railroads. "Such action in the judgement of the committee, is in the interest not only of American railroads, and especially of American transcontinental lines, but in the interest of American commerce and of the general prosperity of the American people."<sup>37</sup>

The failure of the American Congress to take any decisive steps in regard to Canadian competition is an interesting analogy to the breakdown of the Canadian attempt to provide a monopoly and freedom from American competition to the Canadian Pacific. Just as the people of Manitoba rebelled at non-competitive rates, and secured the right to charter roads to the American border in 1888, the people of the North-west and the New Englanders demonstrated that their interests were so intermingled with Canadian transportation facilities that no arbitrary discrimination could be made against them without serious harm to American interests. In both cases the efforts of the railroad interests to secure a monopoly broke down in the face of popular discontent.

#### DISCUSSION

In reply to questions, *Miss Savage* said that she did not regard the extension of the Great Northern to Puget Sound or into southern British Columbia as a direct result of Hill's hostility to the C.P.R. *Mr. Brebner* suggested that the key to Hill's action was a passionate interest in efficiency. He had set himself the challenge of making a railway pay over the high prairie, and he built wherever he thought revenue could be gained.

---

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, 54-5.

## CANADIAN POLITICAL IDEAS IN THE SIXTIES AND SEVENTIES: EGERTON RYERSON

By C. B. SISSONS  
*Victoria University*

By 1860 Ryerson had reached his fifty-seventh year. For more than thirty years he had been a name in Canada. At the age of twenty-three, and at the instance of the little congregation of Methodists in York, of which he was for that year junior preacher, he had challenged John Strachan, and the whole doctrine of privilege in Church and State. This first of a long series of controversies—the last was with Professor Daniel Wilson and Goldwin Smith just fifty years later—at once brought him into friendly relations with the rising reform movement. The chief figures in the movement were Bidwell, Rolph, and Mackenzie. He was already well acquainted with Rolph, whose father had taken up land near the broad loyalist acres of Colonel Joseph Ryerson in Norfolk County, and whose eloquence had deeply impressed his youth. For Bidwell he acquired a profound respect, as a religious man of cultivated mind and liberal views. Their friendship, sealed by Ryerson's protest against Bidwell's proscription in 1838, survived the years, and during the distinguished exile's last visit to Toronto he was Ryerson's guest, sharing his pew in the Metropolitan Church. With the indefatigable and undaunted, but impulsive and incalculable Mackenzie he could have less in common than with either Rolph or Bidwell; but, to judge from the account of Ryerson's New Year's sermon of 1826 appearing in the *Colonial Advocate* of January 12, Mackenzie at first was greatly impressed with the young preacher.<sup>1</sup> He reports that Rolph and Bidwell heard the same sermon.

The next eighteen years of Ryerson's life were occupied with circuit work; with the founding and editing of the *Christian Guardian*, which became the most widely read and, in Sydenham's view at least, "the only decent paper in both Canadas";<sup>2</sup> with a sojourn of eighteen months in England spent in laying siege to the Colonial Office in the interest of a charter for Upper Canada Academy, later Victoria College, and in deepening through personal contact an acquaintance with English men and movements already formed through wide reading; and lastly in a tenure for three years of the principalship of Victoria College at Cobourg.

It was from this position that he was called by Metcalfe to elaborate a system of public education for his native province. While his entry into the campaign of 1844 was not premeditated,<sup>3</sup> but arose out of a request by the Governor for advice on the university question, once involved in the negotiations for the forming of an Executive Council and once embarked on the defence of the Governor, he came nearer than at any time of his life to putting his soul in jeopardy through engaging in party politics. His want of political ambition, ordinarily so-called, however, is exemplified by the fact that when Draper's suggestion that he become joint Provincial Secretary, in charge of Education and with

<sup>1</sup>C. B. Sissons, *Egerton Ryerson, His Life and Letters* (Toronto, 1935), I, 18.

<sup>2</sup>Sydenham to Russell, March 13, 1840.

<sup>3</sup>C. B. Sissons, "Ryerson and the Elections of 1844" (*Canadian Historical Review*, June, 1942).



a seat in the Executive Council, was not accepted by the Governor, the rejection did not in the least affect his support of the cause. Thirty years later the Rev. John Carroll, author of the great source work on early life in Upper Canada, *Case and his Contemporaries*, wrote an article on Ryerson, at the time of his election as first President of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada. While Carroll did not always see eye to eye with Ryerson in Conference, he makes this profound observation as to his motives: "The Doctor's ambition has not lain in the direction of coveting office, but (and there was no truly great man without ambition) in the direction of influencing public opinion on those questions and measures the carrying of which he deemed to be for the good of the Church and the country; and it was only when an office furthered these objects that he showed any care to obtain it."<sup>4</sup> But in this bitter contest of 1844 with Robert Baldwin Sullivan, the champion of the Reform Association, the fighting blood running full in his veins carried him further into partisanship than his Christian principles could easily permit, and with the new year we find him lamenting the spiritual barrenness of 1844.

As responsible government in time became a fact in the Canadas Ryerson's relations as the head of a department came to be less with the Governor and more with his ministers. Their political complexion was to him a matter of no concern; they were judged by the intelligence of their interest in the system he was founding. The municipal authorities and the public in general at all times were taken into confidence, and their interest and support enlisted. A monthly *Journal of Education* was founded for the information of the local school authorities and the profession, and the daily press was employed at need to explain or defend various features of the system that were new or subject to attack. Then every five years Ryerson carried out during the winter an arduous tour of the province. Some forty conventions were held, usually in the county towns, at which trustees and teachers were invited to discuss proposed changes in the school law and express their opinions by vote. Frequently, also, public meetings were held in the evening, presided over by a local judge or a member of Parliament or other prominent citizen, where a lecture on some educational theme was delivered. If the County Council were in session it was visited and invited to discuss policies. These meetings served not only to create and nourish a general interest in education, but also to keep Ryerson so closely in touch with the public mind that his advice to the government in the matter of legislation was likely to be at once practical and popular. Meanwhile his deputy, John George Hodgins, was developing a filing system which makes the archives of the Department of Education a mine of social history, alas unquarried; while at the same time through the Educational Depository good literature was being made available at cost through prizes for use in the schools and through libraries established in every township that was willing to be helped.

While Ryerson was employed in building a system of universal education essential to democracy—and too busy with his task to be concerned with politics, except in so far as they hampered or furthered his work—the sands of an unstable Union were running out. Perhaps his method in snatching what he could for his system as the political

---

<sup>4</sup>John Carroll, "Egerton Ryerson" (*Canadian Methodist Magazine*, Feb., 1874, 103).

shuttle shot back and forth at Quebec can best be shown by reference in some detail to the events of a single year. The year 1863 may be selected, since that year looked at in retrospect has an aspect of finality in Ryerson's life. It brought to some sort of conclusion two of his main interests—the University and Separate School questions. In the case of the former his hopes and plans were frustrated, at least during his life time; in the latter a settlement was reached which in the main has stood the test of time and which, at all events during his subsequent tenure of office, never seriously disturbed the peace of the province or his own tranquillity.

In another sense the year marked a crisis in his life. During the spring of 1862 he had suffered a serious illness, and before a complete recovery had hurried to Quebec to forestall Richard Scott's effort to gain new privileges for his church in respect of Separate Schools. Now in 1863 after long weeks spent in Quebec, at the command of the Prime Minister, holding the ground he had won in 1862, with the knowledge all the while that the University situation in Toronto was getting out of hand, he suffered a recurrence of his terrible pains in the head and at length realized that no longer could he stand the strain of unremitting application. From 1863 Ryerson is a changed man, willing always—sometimes too willing—to enter the lists in defence of a position which he fancied won, but seldom seeking new conquests. And the renewal of strength necessary for his limited ambition he found in the wild haunts of his native county, where he had fished and hunted as a boy, and in trips in his eighteen-foot skiff, several times alone, between Toronto and his island retreat on Lake Erie.

The University dispute was of long standing. The original land grants, with the increase of settlement, had grown into a splendid endowment. Hoping to avail himself of this endowment for the enjoyment of a privileged communion, Strachan had secured his charter in 1827. But its exclusive character had caused such general opposition that King's College was not opened till 1843. Meanwhile Victoria and Queen's had secured university powers and were offering higher education to all and sundry. They with Regiopolis, a Roman Catholic College at Kingston, secured small annual grants from the government, but desired some scheme of affiliation with a provincial university which would give them a larger and, as they thought, a fairer share of the endowment. However, the voluntaryist idea of no state help to the denominations was strong in the province; nor was it entirely confined to the Presbyterians and Baptists. It was sufficiently powerful indeed to prevent any plan of participation or alienation—as you will—till John Langton and Daniel Wilson, ably assisted by the Governor who was a bit of an artist and a President who was complacency personified, managed safely to anchor a large part of the endowment in stone and mortar.<sup>5</sup> The fine pile which is University College stands as a monument to their finesse and to their faith in the future rather than to their regard for economy or for the requirements of the time. The whole transaction had been laid bare to the public in a parliamentary investigation in 1860. This had led to the appointment of a commission con-

<sup>5</sup>The whole story is delightfully displayed in *Early Days in Upper Canada: Letters of John Langton*, edited W. A. Langton, 277-97: "Every stone that goes up in the building, every book that is bought is so much more anchorage and so much less plunder to fight for" (297).



sisting of three representatives from Toronto, Victoria, and Queen's respectively. Their report had been published in January, 1863. It is epitomized in the recommendation that the name of the University be changed from the University of Toronto to the University of Upper Canada.

The findings today seem reasonable enough, and at the time they so appeared to a considerable section of the press and the public. But the two Toronto dailies—the *Globe* and the *Leader*—saw in its main proposals a subtle and a deadly blow aimed at the University. The plan of affiliation and common examinations was to them just a clever device of the outlying colleges to secure control of the Senate and wreck standards of higher education, while the timid suggestion for financial support to the affiliated colleges was an attack on the integrity of the endowment. But the main consideration in determining the issue was not the Toronto press but the fact that John A., who had appointed the commission, was out while John Sandfield was in, and largely by the votes of members obdurately voluntarist. In May after John A. had again secured a majority on a want-of-confidence motion, so delicate was the balance of parties that the situation for the colleges became even less favourable. John Sandfield had found it necessary, in preparation for the general elections in June, to make peace with Brown who, without entering the Cabinet, stood a dominating figure behind the administration. It mattered not that Ryerson when finally released from Quebec was able to show in the Senate that the commissioners in their report had accepted the unanimous view of the twenty-one members of the Senate as expressed in their reply to a questionnaire; and that the Senate in June, 1863, was turning its back on the Senate of February, 1862. The fact that he succeeded in having the *volte face* written into the records of the Senate at that last bitter meeting seemed to convict rather than to convince his opponents, now in a clear majority through new appointments. Nothing could be done, and from that date Ryerson never entered the Senate. Henceforth Victoria and Queen's and Trinity were compelled to go each its own way, financing themselves as best they could. And Toronto also went its way, after 1868 for forty years in exclusive enjoyment of state aid, training some fine scholars in honours and some pass men who were far from scholars; the pride of Toronto it is true, but neither deserving nor receiving the general support due a provincial university. Then, after a generation, William Mulock and Nathaniel Burwash revived the ideas of the commissioners, forestalling the opposition of Sir Daniel Wilson, now President and Captain of the old guard, by leaving him out of the negotiations until the principle of federation had already been accepted by the Government. Queen's at the end drew back but Trinity and St. Michael's later entered, adding Anglican and Roman Catholic support, to make the four Arts Colleges of a great University. Financial aid has been extended even to two universities which have not affiliated, Queen's and the University of Western Ontario. But within the provincial University the method of providing for higher education, which recognizes denominational ideals in the federated colleges as they work in friendly rivalry with the state college, at once granting them financial aid through the provision of teaching in the sciences and receiving in return the support of their large endowments for teaching the humane studies and the provision of library, athletic, and social facilities—this arrangement, unique in

university constitutions, is a just and natural outgrowth of the policy which Ryerson favoured in 1863. It embodies the principles which the Senate including Ryerson supported in 1862, and which the Senate with the spirit of the silversmiths of Ephesus renounced in 1863. Strangely enough the man who outwitted his opponents in the University Senate a quarter of a century later—and who as Chancellor at the time of writing still presides over Convocation (incredible though it may seem)—was none other than the young alumnus who moved the final resolution at the public meeting held in Toronto on March 5, 1863, to the effect that a memorial should be prepared for his Excellency and Parliament praying that the report of the commissioners be not acted upon, whereupon the proceedings closed with three cheers for the Queen and three groans for the commissioners.

The second issue of the year 1863 was marked by the same sharp cleavage of opinion as to the relations of Church and State. The introduction of Separate Schools into the Upper Province was one of the Acts of the first Parliament under Union. Five years later, when Ryerson returned from Europe to take active control of his new office it was as an untidy foundling on his doorstep. So long as Bishop Power lived it caused little trouble, but when his devotion and cholera carried him off, and Bishop Charbonnel, who began and ended his days in France, succeeded him, there was constant difficulty and unpleasantness. In 1862 the government, uncertain of its majority, had permitted the Roman Catholic member for Ottawa, Richard W. Scott, to bring in a Separate School Bill which would have surrendered much that Ryerson had striven through fifteen years to save. Illness had prevented his dealing promptly with the situation at Quebec. Meanwhile he had received several private letters from Macdonald, written with his characteristically personal touch. While discussing the Grammar and Separate School bills he would enquire about the illness of Ryerson's brother William, the orator of Methodism, recently elected for Brant, promising that his secretary would find quarters for him in Quebec; or ask whether Ryerson could do anything *sub rosa* for J. B. Robinson among the Wesleyans; or remark that Dick Scott was a very good fellow, although no Solon. He informs Ryerson that Scott had introduced the present bill without showing it to him, and that his own plan was to send the bill to a special committee where it would be made to suit his views, but he promised to keep back the action of the committee in expectation of Ryerson's speedy arrival. Alarmed at the prospect of what might happen in an uncertain House and with a leader at times so uncertain, Ryerson strove to prepare a brief against Scott's bill, although his doctor cautioned him against any mental exertion. But each attempt to write was followed by a whole day of pain in the head and illness, so he tells Hodgins. Meanwhile the defeat of the government on the Militia Bill gave him some respite. John Sandfield was called upon to form a ministry.

By the end of May Ryerson managed to get to Quebec, enjoying a sleeping car from Montreal to Quebec and "resting wonderfully well." The story of these six days at the capital, among the most important in Ryerson's life, was never untangled by Hodgins. The two letters which tell the story, both in a hand shaky with weakness, are undated; and the fact that Hodgins did not succeed in placing them has sadly confused



his record.<sup>6</sup> The dates, however, may definitely be set as June 1 and June 3. The former letter describes Scott's visit to Ryerson, who had objected to the form of the bill even as amended and reported by the Committee of the House, and Ryerson's pointing out specific criticisms as well as a general objection to such a bill being introduced by a private member rather than the government itself. Scott had come to see him again in the evening of the same day, agreed to strike out all Ryerson had objected to, and to add the clauses Ryerson had recommended as well as to secure the consent of the government to his going on with the bill. The second letter tells how the following morning Scott, accompanied this time by two representatives who could speak for his church, met Ryerson in the Parliamentary Library. The interview is thus recorded:<sup>7</sup>

Yesterday morning the R.C. Vicar General of Kingston (acting on behalf of the R.C. Bishops of Toronto & Kingston) & the Rev. Mr. Cazeau, Secretary of the Archbishop of Quebec, as representatives of the R.C. Church, accepted the Separate School Bill as proposed to be amended by me & agreed to by Mr. Scott, & afterwards us four waited upon the Premier, & informed him of the result of our consultations, & the desire of the authorities of the R.C. Church that the Government would approve & facilitate Mr. Scott's proceeding with the Bill. . . .

The Atty. Genl. is much pleased & amused that the Separate School question thus falls to his Govt to settle, with so little trouble or action on their part, & that it is left to him to recommend the appointment of the R. C. Bishop of Toronto as member of the Council of Public Instruction. He says he will inquire about [it] of Bernard immediately, & have the appointment made & gazetted. It is by procrastinations & neglect in such matters, that the late administration have lost immensely even among their warmest supporters. I understand that even the opposition sympathise with Mr. Patton & wish he had had the appointment of the County Attorneyship & Clerk of the Peace of the York & Peel.

During the week for some reason Scott thought it best to withdraw his bill, thus postponing the decision for another session and year. Nevertheless the *Globe* took occasion to renew its assaults upon Ryerson on the ground of surrender to Roman Catholic influence. Ryerson replied in the *Leader* of July 12—to better the day with the deed—with his usual clarity and rather more than his usual asperity.

Some two or three years since, I was informed that a gentleman asked one of the prominent editors of the *Globe* why they continued their ceaseless attacks upon Dr. Ryerson, and made statements which they must know were unfounded. The reply was in effect: "When we commence with a man we never let him go until we finish him." When I heard this, I resolved to expose at least once a year the false and malicious attacks of the *Globe*; but as, at the expiration of the first year after forming this purpose, the Editor-

<sup>6</sup>J. G. Hodgins, *Legislation and History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, 1841-1876*, 161 ff.

<sup>7</sup>Victoria University Library, Ryerson Correspondence, Ryerson to Hodgins, June 3, 1862.

in-Chief of the *Globe* was rejected from Parliament by the free and independent electors of the electoral division in which I reside, I thought it would be ungracious to chastise him any further for his iniquities against me.

However, the systematic crusade of the *Globe* since June has compelled him to revise his decision. He reviews his past attitude on the Separate School question. The present negotiations and the changes effected by his intervention, he sets forth in some detail. The substance of the letter just read is repeated, and it is noted that two copies of the agreement were prepared after the conference, one for himself and one for Scott. Thus the whole affair was made a matter of public record, according to Ryerson's custom. The document was signed and sealed, and witnessed, so to speak, by the public through the columns of the *Leader*. The delivery was to come the following March.

The Separate School Act was being hammered out at Quebec during the very weeks of 1863 in which university reform was being shattered at Toronto.<sup>8</sup> It stands as one of the greatest triumphs of Ryerson's constructive statesmanship, his ability to find the middle and practical course. The Act is short, running to twenty-eight clauses, and simple and clear in its phrasing. Here was no hunting ground for lawyers, no arena for the litigious, as has been the case with certain later educational enactments in the province, Regulations 12 and 17, for instance, as to the place of the French language in the schools. It was provided under the Act that appeals from the decision of the Chief Superintendent should be made not to the Courts, but to the Governor-General-in-Council; and Scott was able to say thirty years later that he was not aware of an appeal ever having been made.

Its purpose was stated in the preamble as twofold: to restore to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada certain rights which they had formerly enjoyed, and to bring the provisions of the law as to Separate Schools more in harmony with the provisions of the law as to Common Schools. But as the terms of the Act are studied, the restoration of rights appear less conspicuous than the practical provisions making for a general system for Roman Catholics and Protestants alike. The *Globe*, with its satellites, at the time was pleased to make much of the concessions to the Church of Rome, but failed to recognize the large concessions on the part of the Roman Catholics to the broad claims of a common system.

To understand Ryerson's attitude certain facts must be remembered. After nearly twenty years of development of the school system, there was still no law compelling parents to use the schools, and indeed no law compelling municipalities to avail themselves of the system; and one municipality at least (that of Richmond) was still outside, managing its own schools without government regulation or support. Further the Separate Schools of the Upper Province and the Dissident Schools of the Lower Province were of the very fabric of Union; and whatever flaws that fabric was showing with time it was the frame within which those entrusted with the task of dispelling ignorance had to work. It is significant that in 1867 when the more solid structure of Confederation

---

<sup>8</sup>The progress of events (with interesting sidelights) may be followed in the twenty-two letters from Ryerson to Hodgins between February and May, and the eight from Patton to Ryerson (Ryerson Correspondence).



replaced Union the changes of 1863 were considered sound enough to be written into the constitution, as a solemn compact binding the two central provinces. And Brown, who had charged in 1863 that Ryerson had entered into a deep plot, not only with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto but with the High Church Anglicans, to break up the Common School System altogether and divide the school fund among the sects, and who had employed his powerful pen to arouse Protestant resentment during the election campaign of May and June of that year, by 1866 as a Father of Confederation was compelled to admit—without apology to Ryerson, however—that the settlement was necessary and not unreasonable.

The most important effect of the Act was to notify Upper Canadians that Separate Schools were a permanent feature of their life. This fact Ryerson himself had been compelled reluctantly to recognize. Now the Orange Societies and other opponents of co-operation between Church and State were forced to accept what to them was a bitter truth. Admitting the right to Separate Schools, the Act proceeded to facilitate their establishment under fair terms. But there was no surrender of what Ryerson regarded as fundamental, the right of the individual citizen to decide for himself whether he would support Common or Separate Schools. In the draft first submitted it was proposed to define all Roman Catholics as *ipso facto* supporters of Separate Schools; against this Ryerson was adamant. The Act relieved the Separate School supporter, however, of the trouble of giving annual notice of his support; notice once given stood from year to year, unless he chose to notify the Clerk of the Municipality that he wished to withdraw. A second privilege was granted in the case of Roman Catholic families living in a school section adjacent to a Separate School section. A Union section might be formed, as was permitted with Common Schools, in adjacent municipalities, whereas under the Taché bill of 1855 a Separate School section was made conterminous with the Common School section. The practical restriction was made, however, that the home of the new supporter must be within three miles of the school-house. If he lived beyond this limit, he might send his children to the Separate School, and thus increase its attendance and the government grant based on attendance, but his property tax went to the Common School section in which he resided.

But over against these new privileges stood several important provisions all tending to bring Separate Schools definitely within the general provisions for Common School education. Their teachers now became subject to the same examinations and method of certification as Common School teachers. Previously only priests were named as visitors of Separate Schools; now all judges, members of the legislature, wardens of counties, reeves of municipalities, the Chief Superintendent and local superintendents were by law free to enter any Separate School. Further, Separate Schools were made subject to such inspection as might be directed from time to time by the Chief Superintendent of Education, and to such regulation as to curriculum and text-books as might be imposed by the Council of Public Instruction.

As to Government grants, Separate Schools were now placed on the same footing as Common Schools, with one exception. Individual Common School Boards were required to raise by assessment a sum at least equal to the legislative grant; Separate School Boards were not

so required either by the Taché or the Scott bills. Ryerson's explanation is that Separate School trustees complained of the requirement as a grievance; he might have added that among the poor Irish and French settlers the size of the family raised would be frequently quite out of proportion to the value of the property held, yet the state could ill afford to have the education of their children suffer on that account. Municipal grants to schools at the time were not a regular thing, but certain municipalities were distributing for Common School education the funds accruing under the Clergy Reserve settlement. The law now required all municipalities to divide any grant equally according to attendance between Common and Separate Schools. But in the matter of levying and collecting the Separate School taxes, Ryerson was obdurate. The municipalities could and did collect the Common School levies, once they were fixed by the school trustees; Separate School rates they were not permitted to collect. This distinction he regarded as imperative by reason of the separation of Church and State in Upper Canada, and the fact that after 1857 in Lower Canada the municipalities were forbidden to collect taxes for Dissident Schools. The distinction between what was fitting for the municipalities and what was fitting for the government had since been abandoned; and the emphasis Ryerson laid on it at the time is probably to be accounted for by the deep impression remaining in his mind from the struggle against church establishment in the province, and by the strength of voluntarist sentiment generally.

The spirit in which the Act was framed is perhaps best illustrated by one little change. Formerly Separate School trustees were required to make their returns for attendance on which the provincial grant was based under oath; for Common School trustees a declaration only was required. This discrimination was now abandoned. For the future, confidence in good faith was to be the basis on which all alike—individuals, municipalities, and government—were to engage in the important business of training an intelligent citizenship.

It has seemed best in endeavouring to deal with Ryerson's political ideas to permit them to emerge in his attitude on particular questions rather than to attempt to arrive at some general formula. However in 1867 he himself undertook to set forth certain of his views in a pamphlet.<sup>9</sup> It was prompted by the Reform Convention in Toronto at the end of June when the three Reformers from the Upper Province who had accepted portfolios in the Coalition government were read out of the party, though William McDougall with folded arms stoutly faced his former associates. One of the speakers at this assembly who was greatly acclaimed was Mr. John Macdonald, later Senator, and at this time a leading layman of the Methodist Church and a member of Parliament for Toronto. He had declared his belief that the only way to keep men true was to draw strict party lines and that coalitions were demoralizing. Here, then, was a theory that was striking root deep in Canadian soil, setting brother against brother, dividing communities and communions. At different times in earlier years, to the offence of this side or that, Ryerson had striven to check the excesses of party. As Superintendent of Education he had seen it to be a clog in the machinery of school and municipal government. He must now come to the support of non-partisan principle which after years of party turmoil

<sup>9</sup>Egerton Ryerson, *The New Canadian Dominion: Dangers and Duties of the People in Relation to Their Government*, 32.



had achieved Federation and which the two Macdonalds as first ministers at Ottawa and Toronto were seeking, or at least claiming, to perpetuate.

Ryerson hastens to assure his readers that he has no objection to political associations if they are based on some principle such as the establishing of free trade, or the abolition of slavery, or the securing of responsible government. Such associations often perform a useful work, after which they cease to exist. What he objects to is the system which seeks to usurp the ordinary functions of government in general affairs, to appoint partisans to office, and to organize and maintain the whole machinery of government as an engine to party. It is this evil which deadens religious feeling, undermines public morality, and creates the maxim that all is fair in politics, especially when it is aggravated by a violent and unscrupulous press which merely discusses men and fails to deal with public questions with intelligence and largeness of heart. Thus the public services are deprived of the abilities of the better type of citizens. "Free and independent men in the Legislature, as in the country, are the best counterpoise to faction and the main-spring of a nation's progress and greatness."<sup>10</sup>

How far the pamphlet affected the imminent election for both Parliament and legislature it is impossible to estimate. The *Globe* sought to make light of it editorially, and heaped ridicule on Satan reproving sin. But when Brown offered himself in South Ontario as an out-and-out party candidate, he was defeated—and never again stood for election. Of the Reform coalitionists McDougall received an acclamation while Howland was returned by a large majority.<sup>11</sup> In Ontario the coalition secured a safe majority, and under a Roman Catholic Premier, while in the Dominion the verdict was sweeping. But if Ryerson imagined that partisan politics had been scotched in Ontario, or that his own path for the next few years would be strewn with roses, he was vastly mistaken. He had still to reckon with the vaulting ambition of Edward Blake and with the industry and shrewdness of Oliver Mowat, whose careful attention to detail enabled him to construct a party organization that nothing could shake for thirty years.

It was 1876 before Ryerson finally handed over his work to a responsible minister of the Crown. He was convinced that the change was best. In 1862 he had contended that Scott's bill should be sponsored by the government; now he had come to realize, and from painful experience, that administration as well as legislation must be more directly under government control. But he was content. After more than fifty years of public life—he uses the term even of his saddle-bag days—he could claim to have accomplished something. He had played a part, as great as that of any Canadian, in striking off the fetters of privilege that were cramping the province of his birth. Then he had led its people into a larger view of their duty in respect of education. True it was socialism, continental rather than English, and as such resisted both by selfish conservatives and doctrinaire liberals. But, in his creed, it was necessary and good. Gradually as he was able to secure public support, and pegging down each advance by careful legislation, he improved his system till its excellence was recognized and acclaimed even beyond Canada. But as liberty and law ever walk hand in hand, so he saw his later work as the complement of his earlier.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>11</sup>The third coalition minister—the Hon. A. J. Fergusson Blair—had accepted a seat in the Senate.

POLITICAL IDEAS OF THE UPPER CANADA REFORMERS  
1867-78

By FRANK H. UNDERHILL  
*The University of Toronto*

"BUT in this country . . . what is there for Conservatives to conserve or for Reformers to reform?" The question came from the Bystander, Professor Goldwin Smith, newly arrived in Toronto and writing his current comment in the newly established monthly journal, the *Canadian Monthly and National Review*, in its issue of April, 1872. "What is there," he went on, "to preserve our parties from gradually becoming mere factions, and our country from becoming the unhappy scene of a perpetual struggle of factions for place? . . . For party without party principles inevitably becomes faction; and faction as inevitably supports itself by intrigue, demagogism and corruption."

Regularly in every issue the *Canadian Monthly* kept up this theme of the evils of party in a country where parties were based upon no distinctive principles. In 1874 it was joined by the weekly journal, the *Nation*, the organ of the Canada First movement. Both these journals of the intellectuals pointed out, with a constant succession of fresh examples from the news of the day to illustrate their point, that Canadian governments kept their followers together and themselves in office by a continuous system of bribes to sectional, class, racial, and religious interests, and that this was all that party policy ever meant in practice. Both of them were especially severe upon the Reform leadership of George Brown and the *Globe*. They denounced Brown for trying to maintain a brutal dictatorship over men and opinions in Toronto and Ontario. "Reputations," said the *Nation* of the *Globe*, "oscillated nervously between its black letter and its small pica."<sup>1</sup> Goldwin Smith, unwearied in his efforts to emancipate Ontario from a false and degrading partyism, as he saw it, put money successively into new papers—the *Mail*, the *Liberal*, and finally the *Telegram*—in order to break the domination of the *Globe*. His experiments did not work out very satisfactorily from either the intellectual or the financial point of view. "The *Mail*," he remarked, "has saved us from a dictatorship, though much as we might be saved from typhus by having the small-pox."<sup>2</sup>

These criticisms of the nature of Canadian party which appeared in the columns of the *Canadian Monthly* and the *Nation* were no doubt caviar to the general, and in the long run they were almost completely ineffective in modifying the course of Canadian party politics. The *Globe* and the *Mail* and their cohorts of local papers across the province were steadily bringing it about that every little Upper Canadian boy and girl should be born into this world alive as either a little Liberal or else a little Conservative. And no Reformer would have admitted for a moment that the struggle between his party and John A. Macdonald's "corruptionists" was merely one of outs versus ins.

Reformers recalled that it was only through party that Responsible Government had been established in Canada; and they believed that the Reform party was still a party with a mission. George Brown was fond of comparing his function as publisher of the *Globe* and leader of

<sup>1</sup>The *Nation*, June 4, 1874.

<sup>2</sup>*Canadian Monthly*, Nov., 1874, 459.



the Grits in the House with that of Cobden and Bright in England, the radicals who brought new ideas into English politics and gave expression to the aspirations of new classes. It was the Cobdens and the Brights who were the creative influences in politics, he said, as distinguished from the mere hum-drum administrators or time-servers who occupied the front benches in Parliament.<sup>3</sup> Edward Blake, the rising hope of the Reform party, had this same sense of a mission in politics. He told his audience in his *Aurora* speech that he preferred to be a private in the advanced guard of the army of freedom; and he concluded that famous "disturbing" address by quoting Tennyson's ode about freedom slowly broadening down from precedent to precedent, and declaring that the political heresy of today, with which his speech was somewhat crowded, might become the political creed of tomorrow.<sup>4</sup>

What then were the ideas and principles which Upper Canadian Reformers regarded as their distinct contribution to the politics of the new Dominion? I propose to discuss first their attitude on purely political and constitutional issues, and then to go on to their conception of Canadian nationalism in its various aspects. The two parts of my paper may be entitled *Parliamentary Government* and *The New Nationality*.

## I. PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT

First of all we may list a group of reforms which all tended to make more effective the machinery of government by public opinion. Representation by population was achieved in the B.N.A. Act, and this, Reformers claimed, rightly enough, as a great Reform victory. They were alert to attack Macdonald's breaches of the principle when he gave the new western provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia more seats than their population warranted; and they indignantly pounced upon him when he made use of these pocket-borough seats for his own party purposes.<sup>5</sup>

In order to make the electoral system fair and honest, Reformers also fought for the introduction of the ballot, for the system of having all elections in a general election take place on the same day, and above all, for the trial of controverted elections by judges instead of by packed election committees in the House of Commons. In all these campaigns they were triumphant by 1874 against Macdonald's opposition. They insisted also on the franchise being fixed by each province for itself because the provincial legislators were the best judges of who were fitted to vote in their own provincial community. In Ontario they added an income franchise to the already low property franchise, and gave the vote to farmers' sons who lived at home and couldn't qualify otherwise with either income or property. That is, they established a system pretty close to manhood suffrage. Some Reformers were prepared to go still further. Edward Blake in his *Aurora* speech proposed

<sup>3</sup>See, e.g. editorials on Nov. 28, 1873, and Dec. 29, 1874.

<sup>4</sup>"A National Sentiment!" *Speech of Hon. Edward Blake, M.P., at Aurora, with the comments of some of the Canadian press thereon* (Ottawa, E. A. Perry, Elgin Street, 1874).

<sup>5</sup>"Those six British Columbia constituencies—those six wretched outrages on justice and decency—created in 1871 by Sir John Macdonald for precisely such work as the present," exclaimed the *Globe* (Sept. 2, 1872) on the news that Sir Francis Hincks, defeated in Eastern Canada, had been provided, through the intervention of the Lieutenant-Governor, with a seat in British Columbia.

compulsory voting and minority representation based on the Hare system as two reforms which he thought the party should take up. David Mills crusaded against the appointed Senate and in 1875 persuaded the House of Commons to agree with him, though his party, then in office, did nothing about the matter. And George E. Casey was beginning his long campaign for Civil Service reform.

The two supreme constitutional issues, however, on which Reformers saw themselves as fighting to the death against John A. Macdonald and his system were those of the strict interpretation of the new federal constitution and the securing of the independence of the legislature from undue executive influence.

To the Grits Confederation, from the constitutional point of view, meant primarily two things—representation by population; and provincial autonomy, with a clear-cut separation of provincial from federal affairs. After 1867 they were constantly in arms against any interference by Ottawa with matters of local Ontario concern, and against all policies which tended to blur the distinction between general federal affairs and local provincial affairs. Their main indictment of John Sandfield Macdonald was that he permitted himself and his government in Toronto to become mere adjuncts of the Ottawa government. They instituted at once an assault upon the system of dual representation by which the same individual could sit in both provincial legislature and Dominion Parliament, and they succeeded in abolishing it. John A. Macdonald's interference with Ontario legislation through the disallowance power was watched with a hostile eye.

"There is as yet no satisfactory way of disposing of cases of dispute as to the authority of Federal and local legislatures," said the *Globe* on December 24, 1868. "It is not desirable to have such questions settled by the Minister of Justice. He is by no means a safe depository of so much power." "There is need for a court to deal with unconstitutional or illegal legislation . . .," it said on November 11, 1869. "If Confederation is to be a success the present arrangements must be changed."

But the Reformers were politicians looking for votes as well as constitutional purists. Their "hands off" attitude toward federal interference in Ontario affairs did not deter the provincial government from interfering in Dominion affairs. Blake persuaded the Ontario legislature to pass a resolution calling for justice upon the murderers of Scott at the Red River, and his government offered a reward for their apprehension. While they denounced John A. in Ottawa for intervening to assist John Sandfield's government to get elected in 1867 and 1871, still when the Dominion elections came on in 1872 Oliver Mowat felt no constitutional scruples in adjourning the Ontario legislature in order that its Reform majority might go out and campaign for Mackenzie and Blake. "The true lover of his province," remarked the *Globe* with some unction (January 19, 1874), "must love the whole Dominion on the principle that true patriotism begins with home and kindred, and radiates from thence in ever widening circles till the whole nation is embraced."

The fact was that the Reform constitutional philosophy, with its demand for a clear-cut separation of Dominion from provincial affairs, neglected the most important element in the situation, the party system. Federal Reformers and provincial Reformers depended upon one another for strength and success; they had a common interest in weakening



John A. and his supporters in the federal or in the provincial field as the case might be. The party system made mutual interference by province and Dominion with one another's affairs inevitable.

A major issue in this controversy over Dominion-provincial relations during this first decade was raised by the question of "better terms" to Nova Scotia. The Reformers as strict constructionists opposed Macdonald's procedure in granting relief to Nova Scotia.<sup>6</sup> Blake, defeated at Ottawa, carried his efforts so far as to get the Ontario legislature to pass a resolution for an Address to the Crown requesting an amendment to the B.N.A. Act which would make clear that the Parliament of Canada should have no power in future to disturb the established financial relations as between the Dominion and the several provinces.

"Better terms" were only one instance of what Reformers found to be a chief vice of Macdonald's system of government, his practice of spending federal revenue for purely local purposes in order to keep the members from Quebec and the outlying provinces lined up on the right of Mr. Speaker. And all this improper expenditure might be prevented, as the *Globe* was constantly pointing out, if the Ontario delegation at Ottawa would only stand firm. It was chiefly with Ontario's taxes that Macdonald was bribing the other provinces, and Ontario had almost half the seats at Ottawa. But inevitably to these other provinces this reiterated appeal of the Grit organ for Ontario solidarity appeared only as an acute case of selfish Ontario sectionalism. Alas, it has not been only in the 1870's that the citizens of the different provinces of Canada have found that the most congenial method of contributing to a national spirit is to denounce the sectionalism of their neighbours.

The second great constitutional issue was the independence of the legislature, a good Whig cause which Reformers in Canada had long made their own. Ever since the 1850's the Grits in opposition had felt that the British Cabinet system, as applied to a government busy with the construction of railways and public works, gave too much power to the executive. At the Quebec Conference in 1864 George Brown proposed a constitution of checks and balances for Ontario based on that of an American state.<sup>7</sup> In the end Ontario and the other provinces got miniature responsible governments. But Reformers still remained suspicious of undue power and influence in the hands of the executive. Blake introduced a series of bills both at Toronto and at Ottawa for the independence of Parliament. The issue on which he finally defeated Sandfield Macdonald in 1871 was Macdonald's policy of taking power to his government to distribute a lump sum for the assistance of local

---

<sup>6</sup>The *Globe*, in an editorial of June 15, 1869, entitled "The Constitution in Danger," declared: "The doctrine [of the government] proclaims a new era of jobbery and log-rolling. . . . The effect of the vote is to destroy the federal character of the Union. . . . The question in debate was not even whether or not these new advantages should be conferred on Nova Scotia; but it was whether so grave a reversal of the fundamental conditions of the Union Act could be effected by an Act of the Dominion Parliament, or must emanate from the Imperial Parliament. . . . Throughout the whole debate not one reason was advanced why this latter course should not have been followed. . . . The Ministers had deliberately resolved to break down the constitution . . . and were chuckling in anticipation of keeping themselves in office by buying up Constituencies and their Representatives. . . . An impudent attempt to bring back all the evils and discordancies of a Legislative Union."

<sup>7</sup>Joseph Pope, *Confederation, being a Series of Hitherto Unpublished Documents Bearing on the British North America Act* (Toronto, 1895), 74.

railways without allowing the legislature to pass on the details of how much was to be allocated to each railway.

But it was at Ottawa, of course, that the great crisis in the relations of executive and legislature developed, in connection with the Pacific railway enterprise. The Macdonald government in 1872 took blanket powers to choose between two rival companies seeking the charter, to create a new company if necessary and make a contract with it, to fix the terms on which cash and land subsidies should be transferred to the company, and all this to be done without further consultation of Parliament. In vain did the Reform opposition draw attention to the abuses that might take place when the executive was granted such unchecked discretionary powers. In vain did they point to past scandals in the relations of Macdonald & Co. with the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial. In vain did they move that no directors or shareholders in the new Pacific Railway Company should be allowed to hold seats in either House of Parliament. The issue, as the *Globe* put it, between them and Macdonald was that between "government by Orders in Council and government by the representatives of the people."<sup>8</sup>

"The present is not merely a selfish struggle between ins and outs. It is the old constitutional question of the people's right through its representatives to control the national legislation and the national expenditure; to prevent Orders in Council and Star Chamber decrees taking the place of Acts of Parliament."<sup>9</sup>

"Railways," said David Mills in the *Canadian Monthly* (November, 1872), "create new political and social forces, which may affect injuriously Parliamentary Government. . . . It may be that it will yet be found necessary for reasons political as well as commercial to make all such works the property of the State. Great railway corporations are the most dangerous enemies popular government has ever had. . . . They have marched their *employés* to the polls as an ancient baron did his vassals to the battlefield. . . . They endanger if they do not destroy the independence of Parliament."

Reform indignation boiled over when the rumours about a corrupt bargain between the government and Sir Hugh Allan were confirmed by the revelations of 1873. The material details of the Pacific Scandal need not concern us here. What is important to note is the constitutional stand taken by Reformers on the way in which the investigation into the whole business should be carried on. Macdonald's delaying manœuvres succeeded in preventing investigation by the Committee set up by the House of Commons, and in August he used the Governor-General's prerogative to transfer the whole case from Parliament to a Royal Commission of nonentities appointed by himself. Blake and Dorion, the Reform members of the Parliamentary Committee, refused to serve on the Commission. Huntingdon and the Opposition witnesses refused to appear before it. On the unconstitutionality of Macdonald's actions and on the critical nature of the issues raised by it the *Globe*, Goldwin Smith, Blake, and the Reform orators, were all agreed. Blake talked of Sir John Eliot and his struggle against the despotism of Charles I; he quoted the Bill of Rights. "There is no parallel in English history," he declared, "for the audacity of the Ministers in breaking up the trial and on the same day creating a tribunal to suit themselves for their own

<sup>8</sup>*Globe*, May 21, 1874.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, Aug. 3, 1872.



prosecution. . . . It is a high contempt of Parliament. . . . The privileges of Parliament are the privileges of the People, and the rights of Parliament are the rights of the People."<sup>10</sup>

## II. THE NEW NATIONALITY

One of the things which most impresses a reader of the newspapers and periodicals and pamphlets as well as of the debates in Parliament during the first decade of Confederation is the immense volume of discussion that took place on the implications, practical and theoretical, of the new Canadian nationality. The respective parts to be played by French and English in the building up of the new nation; the problems of extending the nation-state from ocean to ocean; the three great nation-building policies of Pacific Railway, immigration and settlement, and tariff; the character of Canadian civilization as distinguished from British and from American; the future of Canada's relations with Great Britain and the United States, whether the Dominion was to achieve a higher position in the Empire through Imperial Federation or some form of alliance, or whether it was to become a separate independent state, or whether separation from Britain meant inevitable annexation to the United States; all these questions were debated vehemently and endlessly. Canadians have indeed been arguing about them through most of their subsequent history; but one has the impression that they never argued so well as in that first decade, and that nothing new on any of these topics has ever been said since.

The *Globe* was always proud of the fact that from the early 1850's it had been the leader in the campaign for the westward expansion of Canada. It never ceased to preach that the future of Canada depended upon its success in genuinely incorporating the West into the Dominion and developing its resources. It always had more news from the West than from the Maritimes, and generally even more than from Quebec, for it regarded the West as Ontario's proper sphere of influence. It watched with suspicion every step taken by the Macdonald government in its North-West policy. It criticized the first proposed form of government by an appointed council as the setting up of another Family Compact system on the Red River.<sup>11</sup> It was on the alert for every bit of evidence that French Catholic influences were trying to construct another little Quebec in Manitoba. At one moment it referred to them as Mrs. Partingtons trying to sweep back the tide of English immigration.<sup>12</sup> "We hope to see a new Upper Canada in the North-West Territory—in its well-regulated society and government, in its education, morality and religion."<sup>13</sup> At another moment it was proclaiming Manitoba as the Kansas of Canada and hoping that the struggle starting there would not be long and sanguinary as it had been in the United States.<sup>14</sup>

From first to last the *Globe* emphasized the vital importance for the future of the Dominion of railway connection on Canadian soil between East and West. "With the construction of the railway the country will be populated by Englishmen; without it by Americans."<sup>15</sup> But at the

<sup>10</sup>*Three Speeches by the Hon. Edward Blake, Q.C., M.P., on the Pacific Scandal* (Toronto, 1873), Number Two, Speech at London, August 28, 1873.

<sup>11</sup>*Globe*, Aug. 31, 1869.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, Nov. 17, 1869.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, June 2, 1869.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, May 3, 1870.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, March 23, 1870.

same time it denounced Macdonald's extravagant bargain with British Columbia. The promise to build a transcontinental railway within ten years over territory that had never been surveyed, with an eastern terminus in a community of only four million population, and a western terminus in a community with practically no population at all, and with hardly any population in between to provide local traffic, seemed to Reformers an insane policy. And the revelations of the Pacific Scandal convinced them that Macdonald had been more intent on a conspiracy to entrench himself in office than on a business-like enterprise of nation-building.

When Mackenzie took over the wreckage of the Pacific scheme the *Globe* supported him steadily in his policy of advancing gradually, always insisting that the essential step was to establish communication over Canadian soil with the Red River and that the rest, rail communication with British Columbia, could come later as circumstances would permit. A group of Reformers, of whom Blake was the chief, became even more cautious than this. The financial difficulties caused by the depression after 1873 alarmed them as to the future financial stability of the country if the Pacific enterprise should be persisted in. "If under all the circumstances," said Blake at Aurora in 1874, "the Columbians were to say: 'You must go on and finish this railway according to the terms, or take the alternative of releasing us from the Confederation,' I would—take the alternative!" Blake had also earlier expressed willingness to release Nova Scotia if she remained obdurate in her opposition to Confederation. In the end it was not the opposition of the Blake group but the depression which prevented the Mackenzie government from getting very far forward with the Pacific enterprise. But their failure left an impression that Reformers were not quite so keen as they ought to be on the project of a Dominion from sea to sea.

The tariff issue did not, of course, come into Canadian politics with Confederation. But almost immediately after Confederation, from 1870 on, the magic phrase "A National Policy" began to appear in tariff discussions. The *Globe* always emphasized that pure free trade was not an issue in Canada, since some kind of revenue tariff was a necessary feature of the Canadian fiscal system. In its view the real issue was whether Canada was to grow and attract settlers by making herself a cheap country to live in as contrasted with the United States, and by devoting herself to the agricultural, lumbering, fishing, and mining industries which were natural to her. When the extra duties of 1870 on certain commodities were taken off in 1871, the *Globe* repeated with approval David Mills' epitaph: "Died, aged 11 months, the National Policy!"<sup>16</sup>

Brown's attitude on tariff questions came out most completely in the discussion of his own Draft Reciprocity Treaty of 1874 with the United States. The Brown treaty, in fact, while it never came into force, caused or coincided with a crystallization of Canadian opinion about the tariff. Before 1874 nearly everybody in a vague general way had been in favour of Reciprocity. But Brown's negotiations showed that no new treaty would be considered by the Americans unless it included a wide range of manufactured goods in addition to natural products; and the announcement of the schedules in his proposed treaty brought

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, April 15, 1871.



the organized manufacturers into the field against it. Significantly enough they were supported by the *Canadian Monthly* and the *Nation*.

The *Globe* pointed out (July 23, 1874) that Canada's agricultural industry surpassed in importance all other economic interests put together, and that next to it came lumbering, fishing, shipping, and mining, and that none of these objected to the treaty. "All these great branches of industry will be benefitted by having a market of forty million thrown open to them. . . . The alarm has come entirely from the manufacturers, and these are more frightened than hurt. . . . Will it [the treaty] give a new impetus to our national industry? Will it increase our foreign commerce? . . . Will it set at rest all troublesome questions with our great neighbours for a quarter of a century and give peace in our time? We have not the shadow of a doubt that it will do all this." "The manufacturing interest may not be small hereafter," replied the *Canadian Monthly* (September, 1874). "... we are in a state of development and we must guard and cherish the acorn for the sake of the future oak." But this conception of a "national tariff" as a dynamic instrument for national development seemed to most Reformers only a camouflage for the most selfish kind of protection of special interests. In 1876 the Mackenzie government almost took the plunge of raising the tariff in order to balance their budget, but having drawn back then, they tended thereafter to become more and more dogmatic in their free-trade utterances. It was Macdonald and the Conservatives who capitalized on the national idea in the tariff.

Industrialization raised some other problems in the new nation besides that of the tariff, problems to which the *Globe's* response is interesting. As Upper Canada passed out of the pioneer stage, differentiations in economic functions became more obvious, and class divisions began to emerge. In the 1870's Ontario farmers began to form Granges to look after their social and economic interests, in imitation of their neighbours in the mid-western states. The *Globe* was not too sure about the Granger movement.

"The denunciation of middlemen may have some reason in the Western States . . . but we are not aware that the same thing can be said of Canada. . . . Let the Grangers point out the 'tyrant monopolies' against which they propose to make war and we shall help them with all our hearts and all our energy."<sup>17</sup>

"The farmers of Ontario have, so far as we are aware, no special grievances. So large a portion of the real government of the country is controlled by municipal organization that the people may be said to have it almost literally in their own keeping." Still, it concluded that the movement might have good effects socially in making farm life more attractive, and it bestowed a qualified blessing on it.<sup>18</sup>

Quite otherwise was it with the movement among the industrial workers in the towns. Trade Unionism raised the *Globe's* suspicions from the start. *Globe* editors were well grounded in all the arguments of the orthodox economics proving that unions couldn't in the long run raise real wages which were determined by the impersonal operation of the laws of demand and supply.

In the spring of 1872 Brown had to deal with this problem in a prac-

---

<sup>17</sup>*Ibid.*, June 8, 1874.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1874.

tical way, in a famous dispute with his own printers which caused much unholy glee among his enemies and made both political parties for the next few years anxious to pose as the friend of the workingman. The trouble came as part of a nine-hours movement which was sweeping over the industrial workers in Eastern Canada and of which the chief leader was a man named Trevellick, an English trade-unionist. "It is," said the *Globe*, announcing the printers' strike, "in obedience to foreign agitation carried on by paid agents who have nothing to lose as the result of their mischievous counsels that the printers of this city have succumbed."<sup>19</sup>

It can hardly be said that in this country there is such a thing as a capitalist class, much less, like that of England, a capitalist class socially separated from the working-man, closely united with a territorial aristocracy, and in conjunction with that aristocracy wielding overwhelming power. . . . Oppression of the working class such as was revealed in England by the Mines and Factories reports, is in Canada morally impossible. The only thing that here threatens the kindly relation between employer and the employed, and the industrial prosperity of the country, is the gratuitous introduction from the old country into Canada of those industrial wars which were the natural consequence of the antagonism of classes and the depressed condition of the workingmen of England but which have no justification here. . . . We may destroy our happiness by inoculating our industrial system with the maladies of a distant country and an alien state of society.<sup>20</sup>

The *Globe*, as a liberal paper, does not perhaps show up too well in these early incidents of the class struggle in Ontario. It should be added, however, that its news despatches and editorials on the Paris Commune show a remarkable detachment from *bourgeois* prejudices, and that, during the early 1870's, it printed occasional articles on Karl Marx, his doctrines and his International Association of Workingmen, which, if they were read, must have given the *Globe's* readers of those days a considerably better understanding of Marxism than their grandchildren could have obtained from its successor in the 1920's and 1930's.

What was the bearing of the new nationality upon the relations of colony and mother country? This was the question which caused most trouble to Reformers amongst themselves, for on this question they were deeply divided and they fought out their differences in public. The differences divided the party into two wings, a Brown wing and a Blake wing, and the two groups remained imperfectly reconciled long after the 1870's.

During the first years after 1867 the spirit of nationalism seemed to many thoughtful Canadians to be likely to supply the dynamic force which would make one great people out of several little parochial provincial communities. "Nationality," said Goldwin Smith in his presidential address at the first dinner of the National Club of Toronto, "will bind the members of the Confederacy together by stronger as well as nobler ties than Sectional Cabinets and Better Terms."<sup>21</sup> The *Globe* itself in the early years frequently took a holiday from vituperative attacks upon John A. Macdonald to reflect pleasantly upon the growth

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, March 26, 1872.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, April 1, 1872.

<sup>21</sup>As reported in the *Nation*, Oct. 15, 1874.



of national spirit in the new Dominion. But by 1874, when Goldwin Smith's address was delivered, it had for some years been attacking nationalists with all its artillery. Nationalists tended to propound doctrines of independence. In the first two or three years after Confederation they had been most prominent in Montreal. Sir Alexander Galt, John Young, L. S. Huntingdon, all advocated Canadian independence. The *Globe* sneered at these Montrealers and said their zeal for a new state of existence was chiefly stimulated by the bad state of trade in Montreal (as in 1849).<sup>22</sup> The *Globe* itself was fervently and fanatically devoted to the integrity of the British connection. What raised its ire more than Montreal heretics was the constant tendency of Cobdenites and Gladstonians in England to announce unctuously that Canada was perfectly free to leave the Empire if she wished. Separation from Britain, it repeated over and over again, could mean only annexation to the United States. Furthermore, and this was also a much-repeated point, it was undesirable to be constantly suggesting doubts about Canada's position just at the time when all efforts should be devoted to making the new experiment of Confederation work.

But the Treaty of Washington in 1871 raised outspoken criticism all over Canada about the handling of Canadian interests by the British government and the British plenipotentiaries. And nowhere were the criticisms more trenchant than in the *Globe* itself. Just after this came the arrival of Goldwin Smith in Toronto, the founding of the *Canadian Monthly* and the *Nation*, and the launching of the Canada First movement. Talk of a change in imperial relations now found its centre in Toronto. Edward Blake concluded from the Treaty of Washington that if Canada must defer in her external relations to imperial interests, she must have a voice in determining what those imperial interests were; and he began to draw the moral of Imperial Federation. Goldwin Smith was for out-and-out independence. The *Canadian Monthly* and the *Nation* were full of articles about the need for a change, for working out the full implications of nationality. "The authors of Confederation," remarked the *Nation* in disgust, "once appealed to the spirit of nationality. . . . Now some of them tell us that their object was limited and that they set the forest on fire only to boil their own pot."<sup>23</sup> To all this the *Globe's* reaction was to take as violent a loyalist stand as any Tory could have wished. To the *Nation* and the Canada First group this seemed an admirable opportunity for the launching of a new Liberal party which would appeal to the incipient nationalism of the country and make both Brown Grits and Macdonald Tories obsolete. And the leader whom they nominated for the new party was Edward Blake. Blake disappointed their hopes in the end, but it was just when all this discussion was at its height that he made his famous Aurora speech (October 3, 1874), which received more discussion in the Canadian press of the time than any other utterance of that generation.

Our government [he told his Aurora audience, October 3, 1874], should not present the anomaly which it now presents—a government the freest, perhaps the most democratic in the world with reference to local and domestic matters, in which you rule yourselves as fully as any people in the world, while in your foreign affairs, your relations with other countries whether peaceful or warlike, commercial

<sup>22</sup>*Globe*, May 3 and 5, 1869.

<sup>23</sup>*Nation*, Feb. 26, 1875.

or financial, or otherwise, you may have no more voice than the people of Japan. . . . It is impossible to foster a national spirit unless you have national interests to attend to. . . . The time will come when that national spirit which has been spoken of will be truly felt among us, when we shall realize that we are four millions of Britons who are not free. . . . Tomorrow, by the policy of England, in which you have no voice or control, this country might be plunged into the horrors of a war. . . . The future of Canada, I believe, depends upon the cultivation of a national spirit. . . . We are engaged in a very difficult task—the task of welding together seven Provinces which have been accustomed to regard themselves as isolated from each other. . . . How are we to accomplish our work? How are we to effect a real union between these Provinces? Can we do it by giving a sop now to one, now to another, after the manner of the late Government? . . . Not so! That day I hope is done forever, and we must find some other and truer ground for union than that by which the late Government sought to buy love and purchase peace. We must find some common ground on which to unite, some common aspiration to be shared, and I think it can be found alone in the cultivation of that national spirit to which I have referred.

Blake's speech was delivered on a Saturday. It was not accidental that on the following Monday the *Globe* had only a few words about it but devoted its leading article to a long blistering attack on Canada First. When it did get round to discussing Blake it dismissed his ideas on the position of Canada in the Empire as "interesting and harmless speculation."<sup>24</sup> Alexander Mackenzie, the Reform Prime Minister, congratulated Blake in a private letter on his "disturbing" speech; but writing to another correspondent he was more frank and declared that speeches of this kind were unnecessary and that all unnecessary speeches did harm.<sup>25</sup> The *Globe* proceeded to discourage such unnecessary speculation by concentrating its heaviest artillery upon Goldwin Smith, and doing its best to commit the Reform party to its own emotional loyalist position. The controversy was to continue at intervals for several years.

Mr. Smith has come into a peaceful community to do his best for the furtherance of a cause which means simply revolution. . . . If national life pulses with any measure of vigour there will be some things instinctively put out of the category of open questions. . . . In Canada we have got so far on the road to nationality that we *have* settled that Queen Victoria is our sovereign, and that the allegiance we owe her is not an impalpable something which may be rendered or withheld according to the determination of any club. . . . The advocacy of Canadian Independence touches every individual in the Dominion in all his dearest and most important relations. It puts all his material, social and religious interests into possible jeopardy. . . . They [the advocates of independence] might be the fathers of a new nationality but they might also . . . be voted simply mischief-makers, whose insignificance and powerlessness were their sole protectors, as these made the community feel that they were not important enough for the traitor's trial or the traitor's doom.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup>*Globe*, Oct. 7, 1874.

<sup>25</sup>Public Archives of Canada, Alexander Mackenzie Letter Books, vol. 3, Oct. 28, 1874, Mackenzie to John Cameron of the London *Advertiser*.

<sup>26</sup>*Globe*, Oct. 27, 1874.



The truth is that Mr. Smith is a dreamer, not a statesman. . . . Another Don on another Rosinante. . . . Very many [people] have settled in Canada because they wish to live and die under the British flag. When the time comes that it shall be proposed to haul that flag down, the contest may be fierce—aye, and with all respect to Mr. Smith, bloody. . . . Mr. Smith fancies, in the honest simplicity of his heart, that men in ordinary life can be played with as safely as their representatives on a chess-board.<sup>27</sup>

How deeply did all this discussion of the meaning of the new nationality sink into the mind of the ordinary Canadian of the 1870's? By the end of that decade it was petering out. It appealed primarily to intellectuals like Goldwin Smith and Blake, and to the small group who found journals of the quality of the *Canadian Monthly* and the *Nation* good reading. But the long severe depression killed off whatever tendencies the average Canadian may have had to play with general political ideas. "It must be owned," said Goldwin Smith sadly in 1877, "that in industrial communities the economic motives are stronger than the political, and that the movement in favour of Canadian nationality had only political motives on its side."<sup>28</sup> What he failed to discern was that the national spirit which he was seeking to foster in Canada was being canalized into economic rather than into political channels. A newspaper critic of Blake's Aurora speech had said: "He does not show that it [Imperial Federation] would remove any hindrance to material development or add one dollar to the capital of the country."<sup>29</sup> That was it. Material Development. Canadians, big and small, Grit and Tory, were chiefly intent on material development. The big ones had plunged into the great business enterprises of developing the resources of half a continent. And the little ones, as the seventies passed into the eighties and the depression still continued, were finding that the business of making a living absorbed their energies.

---

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, Nov. 7, 1874.

<sup>28</sup>Goldwin Smith, "The Political Destiny of Canada" (*Canadian Monthly*, June, 1877).

<sup>29</sup>London *Free Press*, quoted in "*A National Sentiment*," 25.

## NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND SITES

BY THE

NATIONAL PARKS BUREAU, LANDS, PARKS, AND FORESTS BRANCH,  
DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND RESOURCES

THE restoration, preservation, marking, and administration of National Historic Parks and Sites, and the commemoration of the public services of outstanding persons connected with the early history of Canada, are undertaken by the National Parks Bureau. The Bureau is advised in this phase of its work by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, an honorary body composed of recognized historians representing the various parts of the Dominion.

The personnel of the Board is as follows: *Chairman*, His Honour F. W. Howay, LL.B., LL.D., F.R.S.C., F.R.Hist., New Westminster, B.C.; J. Clarence Webster, C.M.G., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Shediac, N.B.; Professor Fred Landon, M.A., F.R.S.C., London, Ont.; Professor D. C. Harvey, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Halifax, N.S.; The Hon. E. Fabre-Surveyer, K.C., LL.M., B.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Montreal, P.Q.; J. A. Gregory, M.P., North Battleford, Sask.; the Rev. Antoine d'Eschambault, D.S.T., D.J.C., St. Boniface, Man.; Major G. Lanctot, K.C., B.Litt., LL.M., D.Litt., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Ottawa, Ont.; W. D. Cromarty, National Parks Bureau, Ottawa, Ont.

Due to war conditions, the annual meeting of the Board was not held this year. Several tablets, however, were erected, bringing to 332 the number of sites which have now been suitably marked. In addition, 138 sites have been recommended by the Board for marking in the future.

### NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS

*Fort Anne National Historic Park* is situated in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. Fort Anne today is the outgrowth of two French fortifications built on the same site with additions made by the English. The museum building, restored in 1935, was originally the Officers' Quarters and was built in 1797-8, under the supervision of Edward, Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, when he was Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in North America, with headquarters at Halifax, Nova Scotia.

During the year, the sally-port, or postern, was thoroughly repaired and made waterproof. The entrance to No. 1 Powder Magazine was repointed and the stone stairs restored. Extensive repairs were made to the No. 2 Powder Magazine, and the interior and exterior walls were repointed. Additional articles of interest were obtained for the museum.

A total of 7,595 persons visited the museum during the year and, in addition, it is estimated that 8,884 visited the grounds. Many citizens of the United States, as well as teachers and pupils from Canadian schools, and men in uniform, were among the visitors.

*Port Royal National Historic Park* is situated at Lower Granville, Nova Scotia. A replica of the group of buildings which sheltered the first European settlers in Canada has been erected on the exact site where the Port Royal Habitation stood nearly three and a half centuries



ago. The original Habitation was the headquarters for about two years of Samuel de Champlain, famous explorer and chief geographer to Henry IV of France, who chose the location and drew up the plan of settlement.

The newly constructed buildings were officially opened on July 4, in the presence of a large gathering. Ten coloured sketches depicting life at the original "Habitation" were prepared by Dr. C. W. Jefferys. These have been framed and hung in the Community Room. The Order of 1606, Boston, Mass., U.S.A., has donated the furniture for this room and steps are being taken to have suitable pieces made for some of the other rooms.

During the year, 9,139 persons visited the park, an increase of nearly fifty per cent over the previous year.

*Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Park* is situated about three miles from the town of Louisburg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Here were enacted the early stages of the long struggle which culminated in the possession of Canada for the British Crown. Louisbourg was one of the most keenly disputed fortresses in North America. Erected more than two centuries ago by the French, who had named the settlement in honour of Louis XIV, King of France, it was captured by the British forces in 1745, but was subsequently handed back to the French. The fortress was again besieged by the English and finally captured by them in 1758. It is interesting to recall that one of the brigades of infantry engaged in the recapture of Louisbourg was commanded by General Wolfe, who was later to die heroically at Quebec.

Considerable excavation has been carried out on the ruins of this old fortress; the museum, which was built a few years ago, contains many interesting exhibits.

During the year, improvements were made to the roads and paths within the park. The exterior woodwork of the museum was painted; additional book-cases were obtained to house the late Senator McLennan's collection of books which has been donated to the museum. A total of 6,690 persons signed the museum register during the year, and it is estimated that an additional 1,000 visited the park.

*Fort Beauséjour National Historic Park* is situated near Aulac, New Brunswick. Built by the French, the fort was intended to be an Acadian stronghold against the undefined claims of the English to Acadia. Around the fort, Acadians had their homes and farms. It was captured by the British in 1755 and renamed Fort Cumberland. In recent years restoration work has been carried out and a new museum built at the site.

During the year, the parcels of land on which the site of the old British blockhouse and the remains of Monckton's lines of entrenchments are situated, were donated to the Crown, and steps will be taken to have these areas included in the park.

The exterior woodwork of the museum was painted and the parking area regravelled. Visitors registered at the museum during the year numbered 6,409, and it is estimated that over 10,000 more entered the grounds.

*Fort Chambly National Historic Park* lies about twenty miles south-east of Montreal, P.Q., on a conspicuous headland on the Richelieu

River. The first fort, built by the French in 1665 as a protection from the Iroquois, was of wooden construction. After many vicissitudes, it was rebuilt of stone, this work being completed in 1711. In 1760, the fort was surrendered to the British, who, with a small armed force, held it until 1775. In that year the Americans captured the fort; they evacuated it the following year, but burned everything that was combustible, leaving only the four walls standing. The fort was later repaired and garrisoned by Governor Carleton and played an important part in the War of 1812. Under the administration of the Bureau, steps have been taken to arrest the disintegration of the massive structure, and a new museum building has been erected within the walls of the fort.

During the year, sections of the masonry in the stone walls of the fort were repointed and repairs carried out on the north-east bastion and the retaining wall facing the Richelieu River. The iron fence in front of the fort and picnic grounds was painted, improvement work undertaken to the grounds, and a catalogue prepared relating to the exhibits in the museum. A total of 5,986 persons signed the museum register during the year.

*Fort Lennox National Historic Park* is located on Ile-aux-Noix, in the Richelieu River, about thirteen miles south of St. Johns, P.Q. The present fort, which stands on the site of one previously erected by the French, was rebuilt by the imperial authorities in the period from 1812 to 1827, and stands majestically in memory of the defence of the Richelieu Gateway. The island, comprising an area of 150 acres, was acquired in 1921 and considerable work has been carried out on the buildings and grounds. The entire property has been taken over for war purposes.

*Fort Wellington National Historic Park* is situated at the east end of the town of Prescott, Ontario, and adjacent to Highway No. 2. The fort remains as it was when finally completed in 1838, an impressive landmark. Named after the Duke of Wellington, it was erected when the British authorities decided to fortify Prescott as one of the most vulnerable points of attack in the War of 1812, and as the main base for the defence of communications between Kingston and Montreal. The fort property, comprising eight and one-half acres, was acquired in 1923.

During the year, the building formerly used as the officers' quarters was reshingled, the palisades and flag pole repaired, improvements made to the parking area, cannon on the grounds painted, and the fence enclosing the park repaired. Additional articles of interest were obtained for the museum. Visitors registered during the year numbered 8,821.

*Fort Malden National Historic Park* is situated in Amherstburg, Ontario. The fort was built in 1797-9 by the Second Battalion, Royal Canadian Volunteers. It was strengthened in 1812 as the principal military station on the western frontier, and dismantled and abandoned in September, 1813. Only slight evidences of the original fortifications remain, and an area of about four acres comprising a portion of these has been acquired. Of particular interest is the fireproof museum, constructed in 1939, which has been suitably furnished and already contains many interesting exhibits.



During the year, a full-time caretaker was appointed. The exterior woodwork of the museum was painted, and the stonework around the basement windows and front entrance steps repointed; a partition was constructed in the basement and two oak racks were built to receive the guns which are on display. Many articles of interest have been presented to the museum, among them being a hand-pump fire engine formerly used at Fort Malden, and a hand-press upon which the first issue of *The Amherstburg Echo* was printed.

The interest that is being taken in this park is shown by the fact that during the past nine months, when a record of attendance was kept, 11,821 persons entered the museum and it is estimated that 1,000 more visited the park.

*Fort Prince of Wales National Historic Park* is situated at the mouth of Churchill River, Churchill, Manitoba, and comprises an area of approximately fifty acres. The fort was built from plans drawn by English military engineers, to secure control of Hudson Bay for the Hudson's Bay Company and England. Construction was commenced in 1733 and completed in 1771. It was surrendered to, and partially destroyed by, a French naval force under La Pérouse in 1782. Its ruins, which are among the most interesting military remains on this continent, have been partly restored and over forty old cannon have been unearthed and suitably mounted on the walls of the fort.

During the year, the signs affixed to the walls of the fort were repaired and general supervision maintained.

#### NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES

*Birthplace of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, St. Lin, P.Q.*—The house in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada from 1896 to 1911, was born, was formally opened, and the boulder and tablet in front of the house unveiled by the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King on November 20, 1941, the one-hundredth anniversary of Sir Wilfrid's birth. The house was purchased by the Dominion government and has been restored and suitably furnished.

During the year the following sites were marked:

*Sir Samuel Leonard Tilley, Gagetown, N.B.*—A bronze plate was affixed to the Post Office Building in memory of Sir Samuel Leonard Tilley, K.C.M.G., a Father of Confederation; Premier and Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and Minister of Finance of Canada. He was born at Gagetown in 1818, and died in Saint John in 1896.

*Treaty with Indians, 1778, Saint John, N.B.*—A bronze tablet was affixed to a monument on Fort Howe Hill, in honour of the Abbé Joseph Mathurin Bourq and the Honourable Michael Francklin, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, for their services in keeping the Indians of Nova Scotia loyal to the Crown during the American Revolution by a Treaty of Peace made at Fort Howe on September 24, 1778.

*Charles Fisher, Fredericton, N.B.*—A bronze plate was affixed to the Legislative Assembly Building in memory of Charles Fisher, a Father of Confederation; lawyer, statesman, and judge; Premier of New Brunswick, 1851-61. He was born in Fredericton on September 16, 1808, and died in Fredericton on December 8, 1880.

*William Henry Steeves, Saint John, N.B.*—A bronze plate was placed in the main hallway of the New Brunswick Museum in memory of William Henry Steeves, a Father of Confederation; industrialist and legislator; Senator, 1867-73. He was born at Hillsborough on May 20, 1814, and died in Saint John on December 9, 1873.

*John Mercer Johnson, Chatham, N.B.*—A bronze plate was attached to the Post Office Building in memory of John Mercer Johnson, a Father of Confederation and Speaker of the New Brunswick Assembly. He was born in Liverpool, England, on October 10, 1818, and died at Chatham, New Brunswick, on November 8, 1868.

*John Hamilton Gray, Saint John, N.B.*—A bronze plate was placed on one of the inner walls of the New Brunswick Museum in memory of John Hamilton Gray, a Father of Confederation; lawyer, legislator, and historian; Speaker of the New Brunswick Assembly, 1866-7, and Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. He was born at St. George's, Bermuda, in 1814, and died in Victoria, B.C., on June 5, 1889.

*Peter Mitchell, Newcastle, N.B.*—A bronze tablet was affixed to the Post Office Building in memory of Peter Mitchell, a Father of Confederation; lawyer, legislator, and journalist; Premier of New Brunswick, 1865-7, and Senator, 1867-72. He was born at Newcastle on January 4, 1824, and died in Montreal on October 25, 1899.

*Sir James McPherson Le Moine, Quebec, P.Q.*—A bronze tablet was placed on an inner wall of Morrin College in memory of Sir James McPherson Le Moine, Kt., D.C.L., F.R.S.C., author, historian, and ornithologist. He was born in Quebec City on January 24, 1825, and died at Spencer Grange, Sillery, on February 5, 1912. The tablet was unveiled under the auspices of the Quebec Literary and Historical Society on January 14, 1942.

*Joseph Bouchette, Quebec, P.Q.*—A bronze tablet was affixed to the house at 44 St. Louis Street in memory of Joseph Bouchette, Surveyor-General of Lower Canada and author of standard topographical works. Bouchette was born in Quebec City on March 14, 1774, and at one time resided in the house to which the tablet is affixed. He died in Montreal on April 9, 1841. The tablet was unveiled under the auspices of the Quebec Land Surveyors Association on April 16, 1941.

*Chemin Royal (King's Highway) Quebec, P.Q.*—A bronze tablet was affixed to St. John's Gate, to commemorate the historic events connected with this highway. On August 5, 1734, Lanouillier de Boiscler, Chief Roadmaster of New France, started from Quebec by coach for Montreal, thus officially inaugurating the King's Highway in Canada.



## REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

By NORMAN FEE

THE Executive and Council of the Canadian Historical Association held four meetings during the year, one at Kingston and three at Toronto. The annual meeting was held at Trinity College, the University of Toronto, on May 25 and 26, the sessions being concurrent with those of the Canadian Political Science Association. Council, which for a considerable time had been concerned with the expense incurred in printing the annual *Report* of the Association, and also with the limited number of papers on specialized subjects contributed for publication in the *Canadian Historical Review*, appointed a committee at the meeting in Kingston on May 23, 1941, to explore the possibility of having the *Report* of the Association published as part of the *Canadian Historical Review*. One advantage of the proposed amalgamation is that historical articles which ordinarily would be printed in the *Report* of the Association only, would be available for the *Review* where they would enjoy a much larger circulation and consequent usefulness. The committee named submitted an extensive memorandum on the proposed amalgamation, in which the financial problem, the editorial management, and other more general considerations were analysed. At the meeting in Toronto on May 25, two possible plans for the amalgamation were discussed; one, to retain the membership fee of \$3.00 as at present, and print historical pamphlets to be distributed free to members and to be sold to outsiders; two, to make all subscribers to the *Review* members of the Association, and reduce the annual membership fee to \$2.00. The general meeting seemed to be in agreement as to the desirability of a change and after considerable discussion referred the whole matter to the incoming Council for further investigation. The new Council, in accordance with this instruction, named George W. Brown, Fred Landon, and R. G. Riddell a committee to consider the proposal in detail and report to the Council at the autumn meeting. Mr. George W. Brown, editor of the *Canadian Historical Review*, and Mr. R. M. Saunders, editor of the *Report* of the Association, would welcome suggestions on the matter from members and subscribers.

The Association received a grant of \$250 from the Committee on Grants-in-Aid of the Canadian Social Science Research Council which was, by unanimous consent, paid over to the *Canadian Historical Review* to assist in the completion of the decennial index of that publication. The Association has also co-operated closely with the Publication Committee of the Canadian Social Science Research Council in the administration of the Rockefeller Grant. During the year, reading committees were named to read the Longley manuscript on the life of Sir Francis Hincks, the Lower manuscript on the history of the timber trade between Canada and Great Britain, and Morden Long's manuscript on the French régime. A committee was also named to examine the application of Dr. V. J. Kisilewsky for a grant-in-aid of \$5,000 towards the preparation of a history of the Ukrainians in Canada.

The chairman of the Radio Committee, Mr. Riddell, reported that he had had considerable correspondence with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and had offered suggestions to that body regarding the seventy-fifth anniversary of Confederation, and had also offered material for the use of the Canadian Council on Citizenship.

## THE ANNUAL MEETING

In point of attendance, quality of the papers, and general interest the meeting was equal to any the Association has ever had. At the first session, which was arranged in recognition of the 300th anniversary of Montreal, papers were presented by Dr. Gustave Lanctot, the Dominion Archivist, by M. Jean Bruchési, Sous-Secrétaire de la Province de Québec on "Monsieur de la Dauversière et la Fondation de Montréal," and by Professor E. R. Adair of McGill University on "The Evolution of Montreal during the French Régime." All but one of the remaining sessions centred around the period from Confederation to the end of the nineteenth century. The presidential address of Professor Fred Landon of the University of Western Ontario was a survey of conditions in Canada in the 1880's. Two papers were read at a session on Canadian-American relations, "The Fur Seal Fisheries and the Freedom of the Seas" by Professor Charles C. Tansill of Fordham University, and "The United States and Canadian Railway Competition in the North-West" by Miss Lorna Savage of Columbia University. Canadian political ideas in the sixties and seventies were discussed in papers on Egerton Ryerson by Professor C. B. Sissons, of Victoria College, Toronto, on George Etienne Cartier by Professor J. I. Cooper of McGill University, and on "The Upper Canadian Reformers" by Professor F. H. Underhill, University of Toronto. "The Failure of the Historians," by Professor H. N. Fieldhouse of the University of Manitoba, provided a basis for discussion in a general session. Professor Fieldhouse's paper had been circulated previously in mimeographed form. The discussion was led by Professors R. G. Trotter of Queen's University, J. B. Brebner of Columbia University and Chester W. New of McMaster University. At a joint session with the Canadian Political Science Association two papers were read: "Political Nationalism and Confederation" by Professor F. R. Scott of McGill University and "Economic Nationalism and Confederation" by Professor D. G. Creighton of the University of Toronto.

The following officers were elected: President, A. R. M. Lower, United College, Winnipeg; vice-president, George W. Brown, University of Toronto; English secretary-treasurer, Norman Fee, The Public Archives, Ottawa; French secretary, Séraphin Marion, The Public Archives, Ottawa; new members of Council, to retire in 1945, John Irwin Cooper, McGill University; H. N. Fieldhouse, the University of Manitoba; G. S. Graham, Royal Canadian Naval College, Victoria, B.C.; D. C. Harvey, The Provincial Archives, Halifax, N.S.

R. G. Riddell and R. M. Saunders of the University of Toronto were appointed editors of the *Report*, and W. E. C. Harrison of Queen's University, chairman of the programme committee. The special thanks of the Association were tendered to Provost F. H. Cosgrave of Trinity College; to the Royal Ontario Museum and Dr. Sigmund Samuel, who entertained the Association at tea and arranged that members should see Dr. Samuel's collection of Canadiana recently presented to the museum; to Mr. R. G. Riddell, the editor of the Association's *Report* for 1941; to Professor F. H. Underhill, the chairman of the programme committee; and to Professors C. A. Ashley and Ralph Flenley who were in charge of local arrangements.

SÉRAPHIN MARION  
*French Secretary*

NORMAN FEE  
*English Secretary*



# REPORT OF THE TREASURER

## STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING APRIL 30, 1942

### RECEIPTS

April, 1941 -	Balance on Hand .....	\$ 4.44
May 1, 1941	Membership Fees and Sale of <i>Reports</i> .....	1,175.00
to	The Social Science Research Council of Canada—	
April 30, 1942	Grant-in-Aid .....	250.00
	Bank Interest .....	.81

### DISBURSEMENTS

Cunningham & Co., Auditors .....	\$ 10.00	
University of Toronto Press—		
Printing <i>Report</i> .....	\$364.80	
<i>Canadian Historical Review</i> .....	418.00	
<i>Canadian Historical Review</i> —Grant-in-Aid .....	250.00	
	<hr/>	1,032.80
<i>Bulletin des Recherches historiques</i> .....		79.50
Canadian Geographical Society .....		6.00
Canadian Political Science Association .....		94.00
Creasser's Book and Print Shop .....		1.00
Administration—		
Clerical Assistance .....	\$40.00	
LeClerc Printers .....	21.50	
Expenses, Annual Meeting, Kingston, 1941 .....	11.00	
Petty Cash, including Freight and Postage .....	25.00	
Expenses of Secretary-Treasurer .....	25.00	
	<hr/>	122.50
Bank Exchange and Operating Charge .....		5.03
		<hr/>
		\$1,350.83
Balance on Deposit, Bank of Montreal—Savings No. 2851 .....		79.42
		<hr/>
		\$1,430.25
		<hr/>
		\$1,430.25

Examined and found correct,  
CUNNINGHAM & Co.  
Auditors

NORMAN FEE  
Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, May 20, 1942

## STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING APRIL 30, 1942

### RECEIPTS

April 30, 1941—	Balance on Hand .....	\$317.40
April 30, 1942—	Bank Interest .....	1.58

### DISBURSEMENTS

April 30, 1942—	Balance on deposit in Bank of Montreal .....	\$318.98
		<hr/>
		\$318.98
		<hr/>

Examined and found correct,  
CUNNINGHAM & Co.  
Auditors

NORMAN FEE  
Secretary-Treasurer

Ottawa, May 20, 1942

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

### (A) AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

- Acadia University Library*, Wolfville, N.S. Miss Mary K. Ingraham, Librarian.
- American Antiquarian Society*. Clifford K. Shipton, Librarian, Worcester, Mass.
- Antiquarian and Numismatic Society of Montreal*, Château de Ramezay, 290 Notre-Dame St. E., Montreal. Victor Morin, LL.D., President, 57 rue Sainte-Jacques ouest, Montréal; Pemberton Smith, Treasurer, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal.
- British Columbia Historical Association*. Dr. J. S. Plaskett, President, Victoria, B.C.; E. W. McMullen, Hon. Treasurer, Victoria, B.C.; Mrs. M. R. Cree, Hon. Secretary, Victoria, B.C.
- British Museum*, Dept. of Printed Books, London, W.C. 1, England.
- Canadian Military Institute*, 426 University Ave., Toronto, Ont. Col. F. S. McPherson, President; T. J. Jackson, Secretary-Treasurer; Lieut.-Col. J. H. Elliott, Hon. Librarian.
- Clark University Library*, Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. Edith M. Baker, Acting Librarian.
- Cleveland Public Library*, 325 Superior Ave., N.E., Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A. Miss Leta E. Adams, Order Librarian.
- Columbia University Library*, New York, N.Y., U.S.A. D. B. Hepburn, Supervisor, Acquisition Department.
- Geology and Topography Library*, Dept. of Mines and Resources, Ottawa.
- Hamilton Public Library*. Mrs. Norman W. Lyle, Librarian, Hamilton, Ont.
- Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery*, San Marino, Calif. Leslie E. Bliss, Librarian; Max Farrand, Director of Research.
- Historical Society of Alberta*. Dr. A. C. Rutherford, President; W. Everard Edmonds, Secretary, 11146-91st Ave., Edmonton, Alta.; M. H. Long, Treasurer.
- Hudson's Bay Company*, Canadian Committee Office, Winnipeg.
- Indiana State Library*, 140 N. Senate Ave., Kenneth R. Shaffer, Order Librarian, Indianapolis, Indiana.
- Institute of Historical Research*, University of London, London, England.
- Kingston Historical Society*. R. G. Trotter, President; Ronald L. Way, Secretary-Treasurer, Kingston.
- Legislative Library of Ontario*, Toronto, Ont. Legislative Librarian (vacant).
- Library of Congress*, Washington, D.C.
- Library of Parliament*, Ottawa, Ont. Parliamentary Librarian (vacant); Félix Desrochers, General Librarian, Ottawa.
- Literary and Historical Society of Quebec*. Col. Wm. Wood, President; D. S. Scott, Recording Secretary; Baron d'Avray, Corresponding Secretary; G. Henshaw, Treasurer.
- London and Middlesex Historical Society*. Dr. Edwin Seaborn, President; Fred Landon, Treasurer, University of Western Ontario, London; H. Orlo Miller, Secretary, Box 571, London, Ont.
- London Public Library*. Richard E. Crouch, Librarian, London, Ont.; James S. Bell, Treasurer.
- McGill University Library*. Gerhard H. Lomer, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.A., Librarian, Montreal, P.Q.
- Montréal, Collège de*, 1931 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montréal, P.Q.
- Norwich Pioneers' Society*. T. H. Pobdon, President; A. L. Bushell, Secretary, Norwich, Ont.
- Nova Scotia Historical Society*. B. E. Paterson, President, c/o Halifax Club, Halifax, N.S.; W. L. Payzant, Secretary.
- Ohio State University, University Library*, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
- Ontario Dept. of Highways*, Fort Henry, Kingston, Ont.
- Ontario Historical Society*. Dr. J. J. Talman, President, University of Western Ontario, London; J. McE. Murray, Secretary-Treasurer, Normal School Building, Toronto.
- Ottawa, Société Historique d'*. Louis Charbonneau, Président, Ecole Normale, Université d'Ottawa; R. P. E. Thivierge, Secrétaire, Université d'Ottawa.
- Peterborough Public Library*, Peterborough, Ont.
- Princeton University Library*, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Lawrence Heyl, Acting Librarian.



- Provincial Library of Alberta.* Colin G. Groff, Acting Librarian, Edmonton, Alta.  
*Provincial Library of British Columbia.* Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, Provincial Librarian and Archivist, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.  
*Provincial Library of Manitoba.* J. L. Johnston, Provincial Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.  
*Public Archives of Canada,* Ottawa.  
*Québec, Département de l'Instruction Publique,* Québec.  
*Québec, Ministère des Terres et Forêts,* Québec.  
*Queen's University Library.* E. C. Kyte, Librarian, Kingston, Ont.  
*Royal Institute of International Affairs,* St. James's Sq., London, S.W. 1, England.  
*Saguenay, La Société Historique du,* Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, P.Q.  
*St-Alexandre, Collège de,* R.1, Pointe Gatineau, P.Q.  
*Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, Collège de,* Ste-Anne de la Pocatière, P.Q.  
*Ste-Marie, Collège de,* 1180 rue Bleury, Montréal, P.Q.  
*Ste-Thérèse, Séminaire de,* Ste-Thérèse, P.Q.  
*St-Hyacinthe, Séminaire de,* St-Hyacinthe, P.Q.  
*St-Joseph, Université.* R.P. H.-A. Vanier, C.S.C., St-Joseph, N.B.  
*St. Paul's College,* Ellice Ave., Winnipeg, Man.  
*Saskatchewan Historical Society.* J. A. Gregory, President; Z. M. Hamilton, Secretary, 403 McCallum Hill Bldg., Regina, Sask.  
*Thunder Bay Historical Society.* Carson F. Piper, President; Miss E. Gertrude Jones, Secretary-Treasurer, "A" Kamden Apts., Fort William, Ont.  
*Toronto Public Library.* Charles R. Sanderson, Chief Librarian, College and St. George Sts., Toronto, Ont.  
*Trois-Rivières, Séminaire des,* Trois-Rivières, P.Q.  
*Trois-Rivières, Société d'Histoire Régionale de,* Séminaire des Trois-Rivières, P.Q.  
*United College Library.* E. M. Graham, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.  
*Université de Strasbourg,* Strasbourg, France.  
*University of British Columbia Library.* R. J. Lanning, Librarian, Vancouver, B.C.  
*University of California Library,* Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A. Harold L. Leupp, Librarian.  
*University of Cincinnati Library,* Burnet Woods Park, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.  
 Edward A. Henry, Director of Libraries.  
*University of Manitoba Library.* Miss Elizabeth Dafoe, Librarian, Winnipeg, Man.  
*University of Toronto Library.* W. S. Wallace, Librarian, Toronto, Ont.  
*University of Western Ontario, University Library,* London, Ont.  
*Webster Canadiana Library,* New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.  
*Women's Canadian Historical Society of Ottawa.* Mrs. J. R. Dickson, President, 2 Thornton Ave., Ottawa; Mrs. D. Roy Cameron, Recording Secretary, 54 Park Road, Rockcliffe, Ont.; Mrs. Beath Morden, Recording Secretary, 4 Frank St., Ottawa; Mrs. C. E. Steeves, Treasurer, 500 Driveway, Ottawa.  
*Women's Canadian Historical Society of Toronto.* Miss C. Roberts, President, 20 Earl St., Toronto; Miss Kate Symon, Corresponding Secretary, 68 Avenue Rd., Toronto; Mrs. J. Seymour Corley, Treasurer.  
*Women's Wentworth Historical Society.* Mrs. George Wood Brown, President, 159 Aberdeen Ave., Hamilton, Ont.; Mrs. Bertie D. Smith, Secretary, 284 Hess St. S., Hamilton; Mrs. W. H. Magill, Treasurer.  
*Yale University Library.* Donald G. Wing, Accessions Department, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.  
*York-Sunbury Historical Society.* Sterling Brannen, Treasurer, Fredericton, N.B.

### (B) LIFE MEMBERS

- Audet, F.-J., Archives publiques du Canada, Ottawa  
 Bacon, N. H., Hudson's Bay Co., 17 St. John St., Montreal  
 Brown, Sir Geo. McL., European General Manager, C.P.R., Trafalgar Sq., London, England  
 Curry, Hon. N., 581 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal  
 Dow, Miss Jessie, Ritz Carlton Hotel, Montreal  
 Gosselin, L.-A., 501, boulevard Ste-Catherine, Outremont, P.Q.  
 Hardy, Senator A. C., Brockville, Ont.  
 Hardy, Mrs. A. C., Brockville, Ont.  
 Hastings, G. V., 55 Donald St., Winnipeg  
 Holt, Sir Herbert, 3459 Stanley St., Montreal  
 Kindersley, Sir R., Langley House, Abbots Langley, Herts, England

Laurie, W. Pitt, 125 Ave. des Braves, Quebec  
 Lyman, A. C., 3520 McTavish St., Montreal  
 Mills, Col. Dudley, 24 Washington House, Basil St., London, S.W. 3, England  
 Morse, Dr. W. Inglis, 17 Fresh Pond Parkway, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Musson, Chas. J., 400 Avenue Rd., Toronto  
 Raymond, L'hon. Donat, 3541, rue Ontario, Montréal  
 Riordon, Carl, 374 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal  
 Ross, Com. J. K. L., 107 St. James St., Montreal  
 Smith, Pemberton, 414 St. James St. W., Montreal  
 Vaughan, H. H., Dominion Bridge Co., Ltd., Lachine, P.Q.  
 Wilson, Hon. Cairine, Rockcliffe, Ont.

### (C) ANNUAL MEMBERS

- Adair, E. R., McGill University, Montreal  
 Agnew, D. J., Lambton Loan & Investment Co., Front St., Sarnia, Ont.  
 Aitcheson, J. N., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.  
 Alberts, Gerald A., 56 Berkeley Ave., Yonkers, N.Y.  
 Allard, R.P. J.-A., East Bathurst, Comté de Gloucester, N.B.  
 Allard, L'hon. Jules, Palais de Justice, Montréal  
 Anderson, Dr. H. B., 338 Bloor St. E., Toronto  
 Anderson, William, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Arbuckle, Dan, 360 Bronson Ave., Ottawa  
 Armstrong, Dr. Elizabeth, Division of Special Information, Library of Congress Annex, Washington  
 Armstrong, P. C., C.P.R. Co., Montreal  
 Atherton, Dr. W. H., 329 Common St., Montreal  
 Ayearst, Morley, New York University, New York, N.Y.  
 Bailey, A. H., 1001 Lumsden Bldg., Toronto  
 Bailey, Alfred, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.  
 Bairstow, E. J., Anaconda American Brass Ltd., New Toronto  
 Balkwill, M. A., 41 Buckingham Ave., Toronto  
 Barbeau, C.-M., 260 rue McLaren, Ottawa  
 Baylis, S. M., 3574 University St., Montreal  
 Bell, Dr. Winthrop, Chester, N.S.  
 Bernier, J.-E., 27, Deuxième Avenue, Iberville, P.Q.  
 Berridge, Dr. W. A., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.  
 Bird, John, *Winnipeg Tribune*, Winnipeg  
 Birks, W. M., c/o Henry Birks & Sons, Montreal  
 Bladen, V. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Bland, Rev. Salem, 554 Spadina Ave., Toronto  
 Bogart, E. C., 4 Wychwood Park, Toronto  
 Bois, H. C., Coopérative Fédérée de Québec, 130 est, rue St-Paul, Montréal  
 Bond, Charles Verne, Meta, Kentucky, U.S.A.  
 Bonham, Milledge L., Jr., Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y.  
 Boothroyd, E. E., Bishop's College, Lennoxville, P.Q.  
 Boutilier, Miss Helen R., 980 West 22 Ave., Vancouver  
 Brady, Alexander, Economics Building, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Brault, Lucien, Archives nationales, Ottawa  
 Brebner, J. Bartlet, Dept. of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Brierley, J. G., Canada Life Bldg., 275 St. James St. W., Montreal  
 Brisebois, Napoléon, 1931, rue Centre, Montréal  
 Britnell, G. E., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Bronson, F. E., 725 Acacia Ave., Rockcliffe, Ont.  
 Brough, T. A., 4679 W. 15th St., Vancouver  
 Brouillette, Benoit, 535 avenue Viger, Montréal  
 Brown, George W., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Brown, W. J., 1006 Wellington St., London, Ont.  
 Browne, Lieut.-Col. Peter L., 3766 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal  
 Bruce, Hon. R. Randolph, Invermere, B.C.  
 Bruchési, Jean, Sous-Secrétaire de la Province, 273 ave. Laurier, Québec  
 Burford, W. T., Canadian Federation of Labour, 126A Sparks St., Ottawa  
 Burpee, L. J., 22 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa  
 Burt, A. L., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Cameron, Dr. G. S., 318 Stewart St., Peterborough, Ont.  
 Campbell, J. A., 2000 Cedar Crescent, Vancouver  
 Cantlie, Lieut.-Col. G. S., 1106 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal



(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Cardin, L'hon. P.-J.-Arthur, Chambre des Communes, Ottawa  
 Carmichael, Col. Dougall, 64 Fulton Ave., Ottawa  
 Carrière, Joseph M., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
 Carrothers, W. A., Public Utilities Comm., 510 Central Bldg., Victoria, B.C.  
 Carson, F. J., Newman Hall, 89 St. George St., Toronto  
 Carter, Miss Gwendolyn M., 6 Appleby Rd., Wellesley, Mass., U.S.A.  
 Caty, J. J., Ramore, Ont.  
 Chapais, Sir Thomas, Hôtel du Sénat, Ottawa  
 Chartier, Mgr, Université de Montréal, 1265, rue St-Denis, Montréal  
 Chicoutimi, Séminaire de, Chicoutimi, P.Q.  
 Clark, S. Delbert, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Clay, Charles, 124 Wellington St., Ottawa  
 Clerihue, V. R., 553 Granville St., Vancouver  
 Cleverdon, Miss Catherine L., 33 Deshon Ave., Bronxville, N.Y.  
 Cleworth, Rev. T. S., 346 Chicago Ave., Savanna, Ill.  
 Coats, R. H., 176 Manor Ave., Rockcliffe, Ont.  
 Colby, C. W., 1240 Pine Ave. W., Montreal  
 Cole, Arthur J., 244 Arlington Ave., Toronto  
 Coleman, E. H., Under-Secretary of State, Ottawa  
 Cooke, A. C., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Cooper, John Irwin, McGill University, Montreal  
 Cooper, J. R., Box 362, Cobourg, Ont.  
 Corey, Albert B., St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y.  
 Corless, C. V., Mond Nickel Co., Tillsonburg, Ont.  
 Cousland, K. H., Emmanuel College, Toronto  
 Coutts, G. B., 517 Seventh Ave. W., Calgary  
 Coyne, J. B., 602 Great West Permanent Bldg., Winnipeg  
 Crean, J. G., 13 Old Forest Hill Road, Toronto  
 Creighton, Donald G., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Cronkite, F. C., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Crosse, Jesse E., 31 Sidney Place, Brooklyn, N.Y.  
 Crouse, Nellis M., 414 Cayuga Heights Road, Ithaca, N.Y.  
 Cudmore, S. A., Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa  
 Cunningham, Lieut.-Col. J. F., 400 Laurier Ave. E., Ottawa  
 Currie, A. W., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Dadson, Thomas, Wolfville, N.S.  
 Dandurand, L'hon. sénateur R., 548, rue Sherbrooke-ouest, Montréal  
 Dawson, R. MacG., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto  
 Delâge, L'hon. Cyrille-F., Palais législatif, Québec  
 Demers, M. le juge Philippe, Palais de Justice, Montréal  
 Dent, C. R., 24 Rowanwood Ave., Toronto  
 D'Eschambault, M. l'abbé Antoine, Archevêché de St-Boniface, Man.  
 Desranleau, S. Exc. Mgr P., Sherbrooke, P.Q.  
 Desrosiers, M. l'abbé Adélard, Principal de l'École Normale, Montréal  
 Dewey, A. Gordon, 1 Clark St., Brooklyn, N.Y.  
 Dobbin, R. L., 622 George St., Peterborough, Ont.  
 Dorland, Arthur Garratt, University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.  
 Dorrance, Graeme S., Foreign Exchange Control Board, Ottawa  
 Drummond, Lady, 3432 Drummond St., Montreal  
 Duff, Louis Blake, Niagara Finance Company Limited, Welland, Ont.  
 Duguid, Col. A. Fortescue, D.S.O., Historical Section, Dept. of National Defence, Daly Bldg., Ottawa  
 Duhamel, Roger, 3189, rue Maplewood, Apt. 12, Montréal  
 Dunlop, J. R. V., 1535 Nanton Ave., Vancouver  
 Easterbrook, W. T., 6776 Granville St., Vancouver  
 Eastman, Mack, 17 Oakmount Road, Toronto  
 Edwards, Manley J., House of Commons, Ottawa  
 Elliott, T. C., Box 775, Walla Walla, Wash.  
 Ells, Miss Margaret, Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax  
 Ewart, T. S., 6 Lakeview Terrace, Ottawa  
 Fabre-Surveyer, L'hon. Juge E., 128, avenue Maplewood, Outremont, P.Q.

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Fee, Norman, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa
- Field, H. H., 49 Chrysler Ave., Ottawa
- Fieldhouse, H. N., Dept. of History, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
- Finlayson, D. K., Grand River, Richmond Co., N.S.
- Fleming, R. H., 59 Pine Crescent, Toronto
- Flenley, R., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Foran, Mrs. T. P., 147 Wilbrod St., Ottawa
- Forsey, E. A., McGill University, Montreal
- Fortier, F., 4397, rue St-André, Montréal
- Foster, Miss Joan, Trafalgar School for Girls, Montreal
- Franklin, Harry L., 2700 Q Street N.W., Kew Gardens, Apt. 317, Washington, D.C.
- Fraser, F. W., Can. Govt. Trade Commissioner, Kingston, Jamaica, B.W.I.
- Gamble, C. L., 212 Park Ave., Brantford, Ont.
- Garland, Rev. M. A., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Garneau, Sir J. Georges, 136 Grande Allée, Québec
- Garton, P. Douglas, 414 St. James St., Montreal
- Gates, Mrs. Paul, 421 Mitchell St., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gelley, T. F., Royal Military College, Kingston
- Gérin, Léon, 590, avenue Outremont, Outremont, P.Q.
- Gibb, Harley L., 2380 Cortland Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- Gibson, A. R., 243 Warren Rd., Toronto
- Gibson, Frederick W., 151 Union St. W., Kingston, Ont.
- Gibson, James A., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa
- Gibson, J. D., Bank of Nova Scotia, 39 King St. W., Toronto
- Glazebrook, G. deT., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto
- Glover, R. G., Trinity College School, Port Hope, Ont.
- Gordonsmith, C., *Montreal Star*, Montreal
- Graham, Hon. Geo. P., Kenniston Apts., 345A Elgin St., Ottawa
- Graham, Gerald S., Royal Naval College, Victoria, B.C.
- Grant-Suttie, Lieut.-Col. G. L. P., 110 St. George St., Toronto
- Gravel, C.-E., 3570, rue McTavish, Montréal
- Griffin, John William, 101 Douglas Drive, Toronto
- Grimes, Mrs. Jno., Box 555, Port Colborne, Ont.
- Groulx, M. l'abbé Lionel, 261, avenue Bloomfield, Outremont, P.Q.
- Guertin, R.P. L., C.S.C., Université Saint-Joseph, St-Joseph, N.B.
- Guilday, Rev. Peter, 305 Mullen Memorial Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- Gunderson, E. M., c/o Peat Marwick Mitchell Co., 307 Bank of Commerce Bldg., Edmonton
- Hamilton, Louis, 2 Ladbroke Grove House, London, W. 11, England
- Harrison, W. E. C., Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.
- Hart, C. W. M., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto
- Harvey, Hon. Chief Justice, 10226 Connaught Drive, Edmonton
- Harvey, Daniel C., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax
- Harwood, C. A. de Lotbinière, Room 509, 360 McGill St., Montreal
- Havens, Edmund G., 7736 Phillips Ave., Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
- Hay, L. Hamilton, Chateauguay Basin, P.Q.
- Heaton, Herbert, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
- Helstrom, Theodore, Box 27, Gray, Sask.
- Hitchins, Fred H., 503 English St., London, Ont.
- Hodgetts, A. B., Lakefield Preparatory School, Lakefield, Ont.
- Holbrook, Dr. J. H., Medical Supt., Mountain Sanatorium, Hamilton
- Holmes, John W., 3 Willcocks St., Toronto
- Howay, His Honour Judge F. W., 201 Carnarvon St., New Westminster, B.C.
- Hudson, A. B., Barrister, Winnipeg
- Innis, Harold A., Economics Bldg., University of Toronto, Toronto
- Ireland, Willard E., Suite 3, 1541 Gladstone Ave., Victoria, B.C.
- Jackson, Mrs. K. B., 362 Glengrove Ave. W., Toronto
- James, F. Cyril, McGill University, Montreal
- Jefferys, Charles W., York Mills, Ont.
- Jennings, F. C., Librarian, Carnegie Library, Ottawa
- Johnston, Robert A. A., 112 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto
- Jones, Robert L., Ph. D., Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio
- Kains, A. C., 9 Rideau Gate, Ottawa
- Kennedy, J. F., Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa



(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Kerr, D. G. G., 6171 Sherbrooke St. W., Apt. 1, Montreal  
 Kinchen, Oscar A., Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas  
 King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie, Ottawa  
 Kinnear, Miss Muriel, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa  
 Kirkconnell, Watson, McMaster University, Hamilton  
 Knox, F. A., Queen's University, Kingston  
 Lacey, Douglas R., 508 West 114th St., New York, N.Y.  
 Laflamme, M. l'abbé Eug.-C., 16, rue Buade, Québec  
 Laidlaw, John B., 56½ Adelaide St. E., Toronto  
 Laird, David H., K.C., 400 Victory Bldg., Winnipeg  
 Lamb, W. Kaye, University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Lanctot, Gustave, Archives publiques du Canada, Ottawa  
 Landon, Fred, 846 Hellmuth Ave., London, Ont.  
 Lane, J. B., Dept. of Labour, Ottawa  
 Lebel, Paul, 70 St. Germain St., Quebec  
 LeDuc, Thomas H., 34-47 82nd St., Jackson Heights, N.Y.  
 Lefebvre, Olivier, 59 est, rue Notre-Dame, Montréal  
 Leonard, Col. Ibbotson, 782 Wellington St., London, Ont.  
 Lépine, V. Champlain, Joliette, P.Q.  
 Leslie, James W., 1716 Springfield Ave., Côte St. Paul, Montreal  
 Lockhart, A. D., 23 Surrey Place, Toronto  
 Loening, Mrs. Sarah L., Southampton, Long Island, N.Y.  
 Long, Mrs. Ernest E., 102 Collier St., Barrie, Ont.  
 Long, Morden H., University of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Longley, R. S., Dept. of History, Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.  
 Longstaff, Major Frederick Victor, Seabank, 50 King George Terrace, Victoria  
 Lounsbury, R. G., 1618 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.  
 Love, Frederick R., 356 Heath St. W., Toronto  
 Lower, A. R. M., United College, Winnipeg  
 Lunn, Miss Jean, 458 Argyle Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 McArthur, Duncan C., Dept. of Education, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto  
 McCallum, John E., 24 Wilberton Road, Toronto  
 McCulley, Joseph, Pickering College, Newmarket, Ont.  
 MacDermot, T. W. L., Upper Canada College, Toronto  
 Macdonald, Norman, Dept. of History, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.  
 McEwen, Miss Jessie E., c/o T. Nelson Sons, 91 Wellington St. W., Toronto  
 MacFarlane, R. O., University of Manitoba, Winnipeg  
 MacGibbon, D. A., Board of Grain Commissioners, Winnipeg  
 McIlwraith, T. F., Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto  
 MacInnes, C. M., University of Bristol, Bristol, England  
 MacKay, R. A., Dalhousie University, Halifax  
 MacKenzie, N. A. M., University of New Brunswick, Fredericton  
 Mackintosh, W. A., Queen's University, Kingston  
 MacLaren, C. H., 14 Metcalfe St., Ottawa  
 McLennan, Francis, Loretteville, P.Q.  
 McLennan, F. D., Drawer 908, Cornwall, Ont.  
 McLennan, Miss K., Petersfield, Sydney, N.S.  
 McLeod, J. A., Bank of Nova Scotia, 38 Melinda St., Toronto  
 Macleod, J. E. A., 323 Fourth Ave. W., Calgary  
 McMahan, E., 315 Claremont Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Macpherson, C. B., 172 Walmer Road, Toronto  
 McQueen, J. M., 57 Renfrew Ave., Ottawa  
 Machum, L. A., 303 Cameron St., Moncton, N.B.  
 Magrath, C. A., 841 St. Charles St., Victoria  
 Maheux, M. l'abbé Arthur, Archiviste, Université Laval, Québec  
 Major, T. G., 315 Fairmont Ave., Ottawa  
 Malchelosse, Gérard, 5759, avenue Durocher, Montréal  
 Mallory, J. R., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Manny, Miss Louise, Newcastle, Miramichi, N.B.  
 Marin, C. H., 675 Dorchester St. W., Montreal  
 Marion, Séraphin, Archives nationales, Ottawa  
 Martell, J. S., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax  
 Martin, Chester, Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Massey, Hon. Vincent, Canada House, London, S.W. 1, England

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Masters, D. C., United College, Winnipeg  
 Maurault, Mgr Olivier, 1000 est, boulevard Crémazie, Montréal  
 Mercer, Malcolm J., 106 LeMarchant Road, St. John's, Nfld.  
 Metcalf, Rev. Henry B., Hodgson, Man.  
 Milne, C. V., 829 Royal Ave., Calgary, Alta.  
 Milner, Frank L., K.C., P.O. Box 263, Amherst, N.S.  
 Minville, E., Écoles des Hautes Études Commerciales, 535, avenue Viger, Montréal  
 Molson, J. Dinham, c/o Bank of Montreal, Westmount, P.Q.  
 Morden, W. D. S., 34 King St. W., Toronto  
 Morgan, F. Cleveland, 308 Peel St., Montreal  
 Morin, Victor, 57 ouest, rue Saint-Jacques, Montréal  
 Morin, Wilfred Laurier, 1302 John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Morton, Arthur S., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Morton, W. L., Brandon College, Brandon, Man.  
 Mott, Miss K. Stella, R.R. No. 3, Norwich, Ont.  
 Mulock, Sir William, Toronto  
 Munro, W. B., 268 Bellefontaine St., Pasadena, Cal.  
 Munroe, David, Ormstown Academy, Ormstown, P.Q.  
 Murphy, Miss Ethel, 128 Park St., Moncton, N.B.  
 Murray, Miss Jean E., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Murray, W. H., 36 Churchill Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Myers, Leslie P., 89 Durie St., Toronto  
 Nadeau, Dr. Gabriel, Rutland State Sanatorium, Rutland, Mass.  
 New, Chester W., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont.  
 Papineau, Mgr, Evêché de Joliette, Joliette, P.Q.  
 Parent, Raymond, L'archiviste-bibliothécaire, Ministère du Travail, Québec  
 Parizeau, Gérard, 5219, avenue Brillonn, Montréal  
 Paton, Hugh, 38 Victoria Sq., Montreal  
 Peardon, Thos. P., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Petrie, J. R., P.O. Box 966, Fredericton, N.B.  
 Pickersgill, J. W., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa  
 Pierce, Lorne, The Ryerson Press, Toronto  
 Pierson, Coen G., Depauw University, Greencastle, Indiana  
 Pouliot, R.P. Léon, 1855 est, rue Rachel, Montréal  
 Preston, Anthony W., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.  
 Prince, A. E., Queen's University, Kingston  
 Pritchett, John Perry, Queen's College, College of the City of New York, New York, U.S.A.  
 Prosser, Thornton, 684 Windermere Ave., Toronto  
 Raymond, Raoul, 410 est, rue Beaubien, Montréal  
 Reid, Escott M., Dept. of External Affairs, Ottawa  
 Reid, R. L., K.C., Yorkshire Bldg., Vancouver  
 Reid, W. S., 619 Victoria Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Reynolds, C. Murray, Van Houten Block, 16 Commercial St., Nanaimo, B.C.  
 Richardson, A. J. H., 308 Nelson St., Ottawa  
 Richardson, Garnett W., C.B.C., Victoria Building, Ottawa  
 Riddell, R. G., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice W. R., Osgoode Hall, Toronto  
 Riddiford, Pay Lt. W. J., R.C.N.V.R., Naval Branch, 165 Lakeshore Blvd., Toronto  
 Rife, C. W., Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.  
 Rimouski, S. Exc. Mgr l'évêque de, Rimouski, P.Q.  
 Robbins, Dr. J. E., 166 Marlborough Ave., Ottawa  
 Roberts, R. A., 356 Kingston Crescent, St. Vital, Man.  
 Robertson, C. J., 1441 Drummond St., Montreal  
 Robinson, Percy J., Box 102, Aurora, Ont.  
 Roe, Frank Gilbert, 11919-105th St., Edmonton  
 Rosenberg, L., 25B Balfouria Apt., Winnipeg  
 Ross, A. H. D., 651 Lyon St., Ottawa  
 Ross, S. Exc. Mgr F. X., Evêque de Gaspé, Gaspé, P.Q.  
 Ross, John T., 110 St. Peter St., Quebec  
 Rothney, Gordon O., 7 Howard Ave., Sherbrooke, P.Q.  
 Roy, Antoine, rue Gomin, Québec



(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- Roy, Mgr Camille, Université Laval, Québec  
 Roy, Ferdinand, Palais de Justice, Québec  
 Roy, Pierre-Georges, 44, rue Wolfe, Lévis, P.Q.  
 Rutherford, Hon. A. C., 916 McLeod Bldg., Edmonton  
 Sage, W. N., University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Samuel, Dr. Sigmund, 104 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto  
 Sandwell, B. K., *Saturday Night*, Toronto  
 Saunders, Richard M., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Saunders, Robert, 8 Winans St., East Orange, N.J., U.S.A.  
 Savelle, Max, Stanford University, Cal.  
 Schuyler, R. L., Columbia University, New York, N.Y.  
 Scott, F. R., McGill University, Montreal  
 Scott, S. Morley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
 Scott, Dr. W. H., 416 McLeod Bldg., Edmonton  
 Sherwood, Sir Percy, 451 Daly Ave., Ottawa  
 Shiels, Archie W., Pacific American Fisheries, South Bellingham, Wash.  
 Sifton, Victor, *Winnipeg Free Press*, Winnipeg  
 Simpson, Geo. W., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Sirois, Joseph, Angle des rues Couillard et Christie, Québec  
 Sissons, C. B., Victoria College, Toronto  
 Sjostedt, Mrs. Jessie Winslow, 237 Chapel St., Ottawa  
 Skilling, H. G., Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
 Slavet, Joseph, 7 Lorna Road, Mattapan, Mass.  
 Smith, G. M., Dept. of History, University of Alberta, Edmonton  
 Smith, H. Greville, Canadian Industries Ltd., Box 1260, Montreal  
 Smith, Joe Patterson, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.  
 Somerville, Mrs. J. M., Kenniston Apts., Ottawa  
 Soward, F. H., Dept. of History, University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
 Spragge, G. W., 84 Gormley Ave., Toronto  
 Spry, Mrs. Graham, 85 John St., Ottawa  
 Stacey, Major C. P., Canadian Military Headquarters, London, England  
 Stanfield, Robert, 437 Prince St., Truro, N.S.  
 Stanley, Capt. G. F. G., No. 70, M.T.C., Fredericton  
 Steadman, T. Park, Sandwich Collegiate Inst., Windsor, Ont.  
 Stephen, Alan G. A., Upper Canada College, Toronto  
 Strange, H. G. L., c/o Searle Grain Co., Winnipeg  
 Swannell, Frank, 564 Dallas Rd., Victoria  
 Talman, James J., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.  
 Taschereau, L'hon. L.-A., 187 Grande Allée, Québec  
 Thomas, H. M., University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.  
 Thomas, Lewis H., 324—20th St. East, Saskatoon  
 Thomson, G. C., Barrister-at-law, Swift Current, Sask.  
 Tombs, Guy, 1111 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal  
 Tombs, L. C., 503 Mount Pleasant Ave., Westmount, P.Q.  
 Tomlinson, C. P., 3940 Côte des Neiges Rd., Montreal  
 Tory, Dr. H. M., 327 Buena Vista Road, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa  
 Tremblay, Maurice, Edifice de la Banque Royale, 360 ouest, rue St-Jacques, Montréal  
 Trigge, A. St. L., P.O. Box 121, Melbourne, P.Q.  
 Trotter, Reginald G., Queen's University, Kingston  
 Tucker, Gilbert Norman, 49 Dalhousie St., Ottawa  
 Turner, J. H., 567 King St., Peterborough, Ont.  
 Tyrrell, J. B., 14 Walmer Rd., Toronto  
 Underhill, Frank H., Baldwin House, University of Toronto, Toronto  
 Van Alstyne, Richard W., Chico State College, Chico, Calif., U.S.A.  
 Walter, T. Dayman, 2442 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.  
 Way, Ronald L., 165 Division St., Kingston  
 Webster, Dr. J. C., Shediac, N.B.  
 Weir, Miss M. F., Sarnia Collegiate Institute and Technical School, Sarnia, Ont.  
 Westman, L. E., 295 Riverside Drive, Toronto  
 Whitelaw, W. M., University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon  
 Williams, David, Collingwood, Ont.  
 Williams, E. K., 941 Somerset Bldg., Winnipeg  
 Williams, Fred G. H., 1434 King St. W., Toronto  
 Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederic, 105 Eaton Square, London, S.W. 1, England

(C) ANNUAL MEMBERS—*Continued*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Williamson, F. H. H., Controller,<br>National Parks Bureau, Dept. of Mines<br>and Resources, Ottawa | Wittke, Carl F., Oberlin College, Oberlin,<br>Ohio               |
| Willis, John, Dalhousie University,<br>Halifax  | Wood, Col. Wm., 59 Grande Allée,<br>Quebec                       |
| Wills, Harold A., c/o Northland Post,<br>Cochrane, Ont.   | Woodley, E. C., Dept. of Education,<br>Parliament Bldgs., Quebec |
| Wilson, George E., Dalhousie University,<br>Halifax   | Woods, H. D., United College, Winnipeg                           |
| Winkler, H. W., Morden, Man.  | Woodyatt, James B., 355 St. James St.<br>W., Montreal            |
| Winslow, Edward Pelham, 1534 Pine<br>Ave. W., Montreal  | Wright, C. P., Box 241, Wolfville, N.S.                          |
|   | Wrong, G. M., 73 Walmer Rd., Toronto                             |
|   | Wrong, H. H., Canadian Legation,<br>Washington, D.C.             |

(35) 5 27.11-4-O.F.











## Date Due

NOV 27			
NOV 27 1968			
JAN 20			
JAN 24			
JAN 27			
FEB 24			
JUL -4			
4/6/5			
APR 06 1968			
NOV 15 1972			
APR 04 1990			







F5000 .C26 1942

Canadian Historical Assoc  
Rapport...

**RESERVE**

42015

Reserve:

CHAR. 1942 42015

5 - JUL

